

Midshipman Stuart D. Truesdell to be an ensign in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1914.

William B. Brinsmade, a citizen of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 13th day of July, 1914.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 21, 1914.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES.

John H. Clarke to be United States district judge, northern district of Ohio.

W. H. Seward Thomson to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania.

NAVAL OFFICER OF CUSTOMS.

Jared Y. Sanders to be naval officer of customs in the district of New Orleans.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Robert L. Knox to be surveyor of customs in the district of New Orleans.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Bat P. Sullivan to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of New Orleans.

POSTMASTERS.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William F. Murray, Boston.

NEW YORK.

Daniel E. Harrington, Saratoga Springs.

John H. Mara, Beacon (late Fishkill on the Hudson).

OHIO.

Samuel D. Hensel, Continental.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

A. J. Littig, Flandreau.

Lenora Pardy, Colman.

WISCONSIN.

C. A. Hoen, Edgerton.

Andrew P. Kealy, Hudson.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate July 21, 1914.

C. Rettenmaier to be postmaster at Albany, Minn.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Tuesday, July 21, 1914.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come to Thee, Almighty and ever-blessed God, our heavenly Father, at the beginning of a new congressional day, to commend our souls to Thy care and keeping, that we enter not into temptation, that we may fulfill the obligations resting upon us conscientiously, in accordance with our highest conceptions of right and duty; in the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ENLARGED HOMESTEADS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed the bill (H. R. 12919) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for enlarged homesteads," with a slight typographical error in it, and I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which the bill was engrossed and passed, so as to return to the amending stage for the purpose of offering a slight amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the House vacate the proceedings as to the bill H. R. 12919 back to the amendment stage, in order to correct a typographical error. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 12919, Page 3, line 23, strike out the word "proofs" and insert in lieu thereof the word "proof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MANN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McDERMOTT] is recognized.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I arise to a question of the highest personal privilege. On the 29th of June, 1913, there appeared simultaneously in the New York World and the Chicago Tribune an article signed by Martin M. Mulhall, a former employee of the National Association of Manufacturers, containing certain charges against me. On July 9, 1913, I arose in my place on this floor, and calling attention to the article in question, I denounced it as outrageous and untrue, and asserted that I had never received a cent from anybody belonging to the National Association of Manufacturers. I also stated that I was ready to go before any committee at any time that might be selected to investigate the charges contained in the Mulhall articles. Afterwards a resolution of investigation was passed. A select committee was appointed and an exhaustive and long drawn-out investigation was made, the result being that the committee found all the substantial charges against myself to be false and without foundation. The investigation disclosed the fact that on all occasions I voted in this House in compliance with promises and pledges I made my constituents; at all times, whenever occasion presented itself, voting for the measures coming before Congress advocated by organized labor. Unfortunately, I came to this House a poor man; fortunately, however, for myself, taking into consideration the character of the charges made against me, I leave this House a poor man. I have been compelled during my service as a Member of this House to borrow money. I have not been in a position to go to banks and to tender to them the security they require. I have been compelled to borrow from my friends. It so happened that afterwards persons from whom I borrowed money became the opponents of certain legislation which passed this House affecting their business as pawnbrokers and as liquor dealers. In the matter of the pawnbrokers bill I voted also according to the suggestion of a great labor organization here—the Central Labor Union of the District of Columbia. On account of these loans I have been censured by this committee. The committee in their findings, after reviewing carefully all the evidence presented against me, said, with reference to these money lenders and liquor dealers:

There is no evidence that such lobbies as were maintained by these effected or prevented legislation, improperly or otherwise.

However, with reference to these transactions, the committee hold that I have been guilty of acts of impropriety. In their report the committee state:

The Members of the House know Mr. McDERMOTT; know his ideals and his characteristics as the public generally does not know, and in the nature of things can not know them. His training and associations have not given him the ethical perceptions and standards relative to public office that usually characterize public men. We can not say that he has been corrupted in his votes.

It is true that I have not had the educational training and, perhaps, the social training and advantages that other Members of this House may boast or may have had. I have been invited to many places in Chicago and elsewhere that, perhaps, some Members may think above my social station; but I have preferred to associate with the people who have sent me to Congress, and when I am at home in Chicago I am to be found at my accustomed haunts and among my old companions, associating with the men and boys in the great Union Stockyards, the people I love and want to associate with. My training has been with them for over 20 years. I admire them and love them. They are open and above board. If they fight you, they fight you on the square; if they are against you, they come to you, face to face, and manfully tell you that they are against you, but they do not use the brigand methods of shooting at you from ambush. I never cast a vote that these honest, home-loving people criticized me for. I go back to them, and am willing and glad to do so. They will believe me, because they know I never lied to them; that I have always been their loyal friend and servant.

The committee action I have been discussing is the action of the select committee appointed to investigate the charges against me. Their report and the evidence presented before them was afterwards submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary of this House, with directions to report a proper course of procedure, and that committee has presented to this House their report, finding that I have been guilty of acts of impropriety and recommending that I be censured.

I have many warm friends in this House. Their elections are approaching. I do not desire to embarrass them in any way. I am conscious of no wrongdoing as a Member of this body. My only offense is that I have borrowed money. A

censure by this House would carry with it a strong criticism of my friends and associates in my district—the findings of the select committee being that my associations have not given me the ethical perceptions and standards which ought to characterize men in public life.

I have the highest respect for my constituency. I do not intend that in this House the character and standing of my friends and the people I represent shall be either discussed or questioned in any manner. After all, the court of last resort in a matter of this kind is the constituency of the Member affected by such charges as these.

Inasmuch as the findings of fact made by the select committee are all in my favor, I consider myself fully vindicated. I feel that under the facts in this case the question of my censure ought not to be submitted to this House; but I am quite willing that it be now submitted to my constituents, and from the decision of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House I desire to appeal to my constituents. I have forwarded my resignation as a Member of this Congress from the fourth district of Illinois to the governor of my State, and I now here tender my resignation to the Speaker of this House and send to the Speaker's desk a copy of my communication to the governor. I go now from this Hall to my constituents for the purpose of appealing to them for the vindication to which I feel I am of right entitled. I have submitted my name to the voters of my district as a candidate for reelection to the Congress of the United States. I am willing to abide by their decision.

I ask that the letter containing my resignation, addressed to the Speaker of the House, be read, together with the copy of the telegram sent by me to the governor of the State of Illinois. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the communication. The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 21, 1914.

HON. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have this day tendered my resignation as a Representative in Congress from the fourth congressional district of Illinois to Hon. Edward F. Dunne, governor of the State of Illinois, to take effect immediately. I attach hereto a copy of my resignation so forwarded to the governor.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,

JAMES T. McDERMOTT,
Member of Congress, Fourth District, Illinois.

JULY 21, 1914.

HON. E. F. DUNNE,
Governor of Illinois, Springfield, Ill.

I hereby tender my resignation as Representative in Congress from the fourth congressional district of Illinois, to take effect immediately.

JAMES T. McDERMOTT.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this communication, I take it, which is a formal notice, should be placed on file?

The SPEAKER. It should be placed on file. The House does not have to pass on it. It can not accept the resignation of a Member.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 15320. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to disregard section 33 of the public-buildings act of March 4, 1913, as to site at Owego, N. Y.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 11317. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Newcastle, Ind.; and

H. R. 1694. An act to amend an act approved October 1, 1890, entitled "An act to set apart certain tracts of land in the State of California as forest reservations."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On July 7, 1914:

H. R. 13153. An act for the relief of Pete Jelovac.

On July 9, 1914:

H. R. 4938. An act providing for the issuance of patents to transferees of town lots purchased from the United States at public sale in certain cases; and

H. R. 16192. An act to authorize the issuance of patent to Rachel E. Dangerfield Boast for the southeast quarter of sec-

tion 21 and the northeast quarter of section 23, township 1 south, range 57 west of the sixth principal meridian.

On July 11, 1914:

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war," approved May 2, 1914.

On July 16, 1914:

H. R. 15279. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 300. Joint resolution to continue the provisions of a joint resolution approved June 30, 1914, entitled "Joint resolution extending appropriations for the necessary operations of the Government and of the District of Columbia under certain contingencies."

On July 17, 1914:

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the International Dry Farming Congress, to be held at Wichita, Kans., October 7 to 17, inclusive, 1914;

H. R. 963. An act for the relief of Mrs. Andrew Riganopolous;

H. R. 1138. An act for the relief of Helen Wakefield;

H. R. 1291. An act for the relief of George Gardells;

H. R. 2407. An act for the relief of the Pennsylvania Engineering Co., of the city of Philadelphia;

H. R. 2536. An act for the relief of John Streckfus;

H. R. 2540. An act for the relief of the estate of Philip Felix Herwig, deceased;

H. R. 3041. An act to carry into effect findings of the Court of Claims in the cases of Charles A. Davidson and Charles M. Campbell;

H. R. 3088. An act for the purchase of a building and a lot as a mine-rescue station at McAlester, Okla.;

H. R. 4744. An act to authorize the appointment of John W. Hyatt to the grade of second lieutenant in the Army;

H. R. 5079. An act for the relief of Mary Abel;

H. R. 5746. An act for the relief of Marcus L. Pelham;

H. R. 5884. An act granting to the people of the State of California the right of way upon and across the United States fish reservation at Baird, Shasta County, Cal.;

H. R. 6220. An act for the relief of Hosea Stone;

H. R. 7298. An act to increase the limit of cost of the public building at Smyrna, Del.;

H. R. 7327. An act for the relief of Charles L. Hill;

H. R. 7484. An act for the relief of Stanley J. Morrow;

H. R. 8893. An act for the relief of Mary E. Goodley;

H. R. 9042. An act to permit sales by supply departments of the Army to certain military schools and colleges;

H. R. 9147. An act to restore First Lieut. James P. Barney, retired, to the active list of the Army;

H. R. 9421. An act for the relief of John T. Glynn;

H. R. 10345. An act for the relief of C. M. Hammond;

H. R. 11254. An act to increase the limit of cost for the erection and completion of the United States post-office building at Mandan, N. Dak.;

H. R. 11625. An act to increase the appropriation for the erection of an immigration station at Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 11747. An act to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the construction of a public building in Memphis, Tenn.;

H. R. 12191. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased;

H. R. 12778. An act for the relief of W. D. Stoyer, administrator of the estate of Henry S. Stoyer;

H. R. 13819. An act to increase the limit of cost of Federal building at Pendleton, Ore.;

H. R. 14229. An act for the relief of Henry La Roque;

H. R. 14684. An act for the relief of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue;

H. R. 14925. An act for the retirement of H. R. Drake;

H. R. 16055. An act to amend section 4474 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 1550. An act for the relief of John R. Norris;

H. R. 6052. An act for the relief of William P. Havenor;

H. R. 6260. An act for the relief of Hyacinthe Villeneuve;

H. R. 6464. An act for the relief of Charles R. Grant;

H. R. 6831. An act to quiet title to lot 5, section 33, township 14, range 18 east, Noxubee County, Miss.;

H. R. 10767. An act for the relief of John D. Baldwin; and

H. R. 13985. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.

S. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution authorizing the President to appoint a member of the New Jersey and New York Joint Harbor Line Commission; and

S. 4714. An act to authorize Louis Eder to enter lands under the homestead laws.

On July 18, 1914:

H. R. 5304. An act to increase the efficiency of the aviation service of the Army, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9770. An act to levy and collect an income tax on railroads in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11381. An act for the relief of the estate of T. J. Semmes, deceased;

H. R. 1517. An act for the relief of George W. Cary; and

H. R. 6014. An act for the relief of Serapio Romero, late postmaster at Las Vegas, N. Mex.

On July 21, 1914:

H. J. Res. 304. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain saddles and bridles for the use of the national encampment, Knights of Pythias, to be held at Terre Haute, Ind., in July, 1914;

H. R. 10523. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12914. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 13542. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 14234. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 14738. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 15692. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 13297. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 13920. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 14546. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 15071. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 15504. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 17041, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up the conference report on the sundry civil appropriation bill, and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 984).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17041) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 9, 10, 12, 22, 27, 28, 29, 34, 37, 38, 39, 52, 54, 64, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 81, 83, 87, 88, 90, 93, 95, 101, 102, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 130, 133, 134, 136, 143, 144, 147, 153, 158, 160, 161, and 162.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 31, 41, 42, 43, 48, 50, 51, 53, 56, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 70, 78, 82, 84, 85, 86, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 105, 106, 108, 111, 112, 113, 114, 119, 121, 127, 131, 132, 135, 139, 140, 148, 150, 151, 153, 154, 155, and 159, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Jellico, Tenn., post office: For commencement, \$40,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Norton, Va., post office: For site and commencement, \$50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Prescott, Ariz., post office: For site, \$7,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Sylacauga, Ala., post office: For site, \$5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out, in lines 6 and 7 of said amendment, the following words: "without regard to civil-service laws, rules, or regulations"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 7 of the bill, after line 20, the following:

"Fairbanks, Alaska: For the purchase, at a price not in excess of \$15,000, of that portion of the block whereon the United States courthouse and jail now stand, in the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, not now owned by the United States, \$15,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 1 of the bill, after line 15, the following:

"Albertville, Ala., post office: For site, \$5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 2 of the bill, after line 11, the following:

"Attalla, Ala., post office: For site, \$5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 2 of the bill, after line 24, the following:

"Beaufort, S. C., post office and customhouse: For site, \$5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 6 of the bill, after line 18, the following:

"Decatur, Ala., post office: For site, \$6,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the

matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 9 of the bill, after line 4, the following:

"Glenwood, Iowa, post office: For site, \$5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 11 of the bill, after line 3, the following:

"Lancaster, Pa., post office: For site, \$138,278.78."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 11 of the bill, after line 5, the following:

"Lenoir, N. C., post office: For site, \$7,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 16 of the bill, after line 8, the following:

"Rossville, Ga., post office: For site, \$5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$445,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "; and authority is hereby given to contract for the construction of said revenue cutters within the limit of cost heretofore fixed for each of them"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$679,853"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$502,606"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,942,964"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$38,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,266.67"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$340,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,305,520"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$17,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$485,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "except the justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the salaries of judges retired under section 714 of the Revised Statutes, and the judges, officials, and employees of all courts whose sessions are held in the District of Columbia, whose salaries shall be paid through the disbursing officer of the Department of Justice as hitherto provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"All acts and parts of acts authorizing the clerks of the United States district courts in and for the States of Oregon, Montana, and Washington, respectively, to charge and collect double the fees provided in section 828 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and all acts authorizing United States marshals in and for said States, respectively, to receive and collect double the fees provided by section 829 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, are hereby repealed, to take effect from and after January 1, 1915: *Provided*, That no clerk of the United States district courts in and for said States shall be allowed by the Attorney General to retain of the fees and emoluments of his office, for his personal compensation, over and above his necessary office expenses, including the necessary clerk hire, to be audited and allowed by the proper accounting officers of the Treasury, a sum exceeding \$3,500 per year, to take effect from and after January 1, 1915: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall operate to reduce the fees that the clerks of the United States district courts and United States marshals in any States other than those mentioned herein have heretofore been authorized to charge and collect."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$204,420"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 137: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Alaska Fishery Service, vessels and boats: For construction or purchase of vessels and boats in connection with the enforce-

ment of the laws and regulations for the protection of the fisheries and fur-bearing animals of Alaska, \$50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 141: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment omit the following: "to be available until expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 142: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment omit the following: "to be available until expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 149: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"MACDONOUGH MEMORIAL.

"For the erection of memorials at or near Plattsburg, N. Y., in commemoration of the victory of Commodore Thomas Macdonough on Lake Champlain, in September, 1814, in accordance with plans to be approved by the Secretary of War and commissions to be appointed by the States of Vermont and New York, respectively, to be expended by the Secretary of War, \$15,000 toward the memorial of the State of Vermont and \$125,000 toward the memorial of the State of New York; in all, \$140,000. *Provided*, That no part of the said appropriation shall be paid out of the Treasury until after the State of New York shall have appropriated a sum not less than \$125,000 for its said memorial and celebration."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 152: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 152, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 9, 10, and 11 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the following: " : *Provided*, That the work herein authorized shall be completed on or before January 1, 1915 "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 44, 45, 91, 92, 138, 145, and 146.

JOHN J. FITZGERALD,

SWAGAR SHERLEY,

FREDK. H. GILLET,

Managers on the part of the House.

THOMAS S. MARTIN,

LEE S. OVERMAN,

GEO. C. PERKINS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement was read, as follows:

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17041) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of the said amendments, namely:

On amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, relating to public buildings, marine hospitals, and quarantine stations: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, as follows:

Fort Stanton, N. Mex., sanatorium, \$300.

Jellico, Tenn., post office, \$40,000.

New Haven, Conn., post office, makes appropriations heretofore or hereafter made available for mail-handling devices.

Norton, Va., post office, \$50,000.

Prescott, Ariz., post office, \$7,500.

Sylacauga, Ala., post office, \$5,000.

Washington, D. C., national archives building, \$5,000, and strikes out authority to employ technical and engineering services without reference to civil-service rules and regulations.

Albertville, Ala., post office, \$5,000.

Attala, Ala., post office, \$5,000.

Beaufort, S. C., post office, \$5,000.

Decatur, Ala., post office, \$6,500.

Glenwood, Iowa, post office, \$5,000.

Lancaster, Pa., post office, \$138,278.78.

Lenoir, N. C., post office, \$7,000.

Rossville, Ga., post office, \$5,000.

San Francisco, Cal., marine hospital, \$5,000.

San Juan, P. R., quarantine station, enlarges the authority for the erection of buildings within the limit of cost.

New Orleans, La., quarantine station, \$12,000.

Cape Fear, N. C., quarantine station, \$25,000.

Strikes out items proposed by the Senate as follows:

Philadelphia, Pa., Mint, \$10,000.

Washington, D. C., Treasury Building, \$8,000.

Washington, D. C., Winder Building, \$3,500.

Honolulu, Hawaii, quarantine station, \$22,000.

On amendments Nos. 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, relating to current expenses of public buildings: Inserts authority for the disposal of the wharf and warehouse at Sitka, Alaska, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out authority increasing the amount to be used for repair of the Treasury, Butler, and Winder Buildings from \$14,000 to \$18,000; appropriates \$725,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$749,000, as proposed by the Senate, for repairs and preservation of public buildings; strikes out authority increasing the amount to be used for mechanical equipment for the Treasury, Butler, and Winder Buildings from \$10,000 to \$14,500; appropriates \$445,000 instead of \$453,500, as proposed by the Senate, and \$440,000, as proposed by the House, for mechanical equipment; reappropriates the unexpended balance of a former appropriation for compensation and expenses of site agents; appropriates \$2,650,000 instead of \$2,600,000, as proposed by the House, and \$2,700,000, as proposed by the Senate, for operating force; appropriates \$850,000 instead of \$825,000, as proposed by the House, and \$900,000, as proposed by the Senate, for furniture and repairs of furniture; and strikes out the increase, proposed by the Senate, of \$25,000 in the amount for operating supplies.

On amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$2,100,000 instead of \$2,025,000, as proposed by the House, and \$2,226,050, as proposed by the Senate, for pay of crews of surfmen and miscellaneous expenses of the Life-Saving Service.

On amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$165,000, as proposed by the Senate, toward the construction of two new revenue cutters authorized by the act of June 24, 1914, and authorizes contracts to be entered into for the construction of such revenue cutters within their authorized limit of cost.

On amendments Nos. 37, 38, and 39: Appropriates for expenses of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in the sums proposed by the House instead of the increased amounts proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$175,000 instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the House, and \$200,000, as proposed by the Senate, for punishing violations of internal-revenue laws.

On amendments Nos. 41, 42, and 43: Increases the compensation of two employees in custody of dies, rolls, and plates in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing from \$1,800 to \$2,000 and from \$1,200 to \$1,400, respectively.

On amendments Nos. 46, 47, 48, and 49, relating to the Public Health Service: Appropriates \$679,858 instead of \$629,858, as proposed by the House, and \$729,858, as proposed by the Senate, for commissioned medical officers and pharmacists; appropriates \$502,606 instead of \$477,606, as proposed by the House, and \$527,606, as proposed by the Senate, for pay of attendants and other employees; and appropriates \$256,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$245,000, as proposed by the House, for maintenance of marine hospitals.

On amendment No. 50: Inserts the provision, proposed by the Senate, relating to the condemnation of small park areas at intersections of streets in the District of Columbia.

On amendment No. 51: Inserts the provision proposed by the Senate instead of the one in the bill as passed by the House relating to the duty of common carriers in transporting engineers and other employees engaged in making the physical valuation of the property of common carriers.

On amendment No. 52: Strikes out the appropriation proposed by the Senate for collecting the military records of the Revolutionary War.

On amendments Nos. 53, 54, and 55: Makes the appropriation for the extension of the artillery-ammunition storehouse at the Frankford Arsenal available for additional facilities for storing artillery ammunition and strikes out the appropriation of \$135,000, proposed by the Senate, for additional ground at that arsenal.

On amendment No. 56: Inserts the provision, proposed by the Senate, requiring the assignment of proper rooms for post-office purposes at military posts.

On amendments Nos. 57, 58, and 59: Fixes the compensation of two engineers at Fort Monroe, Va., at \$1,000 each, instead of \$900 each, as proposed by the House, and \$1,200, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 60: Continues the availability of the \$350 heretofore appropriated for purchase of land at Fort Washington, Md., during the fiscal year 1915.

On amendment No. 61: Appropriates \$1,500, as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase of the Dunkard Church property on the Antietam battle field.

On amendment No. 62: Appropriates \$250, as proposed by the Senate, for the care, protection, and maintenance of the Confederate Stockade Cemetery, Johnstons Island, in Sandusky Bay.

On amendment No. 63: Appropriates \$11,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the road from the Highway Bridge to Arlington National Cemetery.

On amendments Nos. 64 and 65: Appropriates \$125,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate, for maintenance and improvements in Yellowstone National Park, and \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$75,000, as proposed by the House, for widening certain roads in the park.

On amendment No. 66: Appropriates \$30,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the House, for widening roads and for bridges and culverts in the forest reserves leading into Yellowstone Park.

On amendment No. 67: Appropriates \$85,000 instead of \$75,000, as proposed by the House, and \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, for Crater Lake National Park.

On amendment No. 68: Appropriates \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, for retaining walls in Meridian Hill Park.

On amendment No. 69: Appropriates \$5,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$7,500, as proposed by the Senate, for the Commission of Fine Arts.

On amendment No. 70: Extends the survey of northern and northwestern lakes to the Lake of the Woods and other boundary and connecting waters between said lake and Lake Superior.

On amendments Nos. 71, 72, 73, 74, and 75, relating to the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers: Strikes out the appropriations, proposed by the Senate, of \$22,000 for sea wall at Johns Creek at the Southern Branch and \$17,000 for repair of barracks at the Pacific Branch.

On amendment No. 76: Strikes out the appropriation of \$5,229.50, proposed by the Senate, for pay of certain employees of the Senate.

On amendment No. 77: Strikes out the appropriation of \$7,000 for collecting the naval records of the Revolutionary War.

On amendment No. 78: Provides for a vehicle for the office of the Superintendent of the Capitol.

On amendment No. 79: Strikes out the appropriation of \$5,000, proposed by the Senate, for the protection of national monuments.

On amendment No. 80: Appropriates \$340,000, instead of \$330,000, as proposed by the House, and \$350,000, as proposed by the Senate, for contingent expenses of land offices.

On amendment No. 81: Appropriates \$475,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for protecting public lands.

On amendment No. 82: Appropriates \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, for protecting lands involved in the Oregon & California Railroad forfeiture suit.

On amendment No. 83: Strikes out the appropriation of \$15,000, proposed by the Senate, to enable the Agricultural Department to make experimental demonstrations for utilizing by-products of trees.

On amendment No. 84: Authorizes the use of \$25,000 of the appropriation for protecting public lands to bring up arrears of work in the surveyors general's offices.

On amendments Nos. 85, 86, 87, 88, and 89, relating to the Geological Survey: Authorizes the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles; strikes out the provision confining the geologic surveys to the public lands; appropriates \$150,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$300,000, as proposed by the Senate, for gauging streams; strikes out the provision to enable the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the existence of artesian water and other underground water for irrigation of arid and semiarid regions by boring wells.

On amendment No. 90: Strikes out the appropriation of \$50,000, proposed by the Senate, for medical relief in Alaska.

On amendment No. 93: Strikes out the appropriation of \$12,500, proposed by the Senate, for survey of a road in Mount Rainier National Park.

On amendment No. 94: Appropriates \$8,040, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,540, as proposed by the House, for Crater Lake National Park.

On amendment No. 95: Strikes out the appropriation of \$1,500 for Sullys Hill National Park.

On amendment No. 96: Strikes out the authority, proposed by the House, to expend \$20,000 for remodeling Government free bathhouses at the Hot Springs Reservation.

On amendments Nos. 97 and 98: Appropriates \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$8,000, as proposed by the House, for improving grounds and repairing buildings of Howard University.

On amendment No. 99: Authorizes the purchase of an ambulance out of the maintenance appropriation of Freedmen's Hospital.

On amendment No. 100: Directs the transfer of \$37,996.70, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$41,209.73, as proposed by the House, out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to the Treasury of the United States on account of Freedmen's Hospital.

On amendments Nos. 101 and 102: Appropriates \$35,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$40,000, as proposed by the Senate, for special attorneys and counselors at law in customs cases.

On amendment No. 103: Appropriates \$17,000 instead of \$15,000, as proposed by the House, and \$20,000, as proposed by the Senate, for defending suits in claims against the United States.

On amendment No. 104: Appropriates \$485,000 instead of \$480,000, as proposed by the House, and \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for detection and prosecution of crimes.

On amendment No. 105: Authorizes the expenditure of \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,000, as proposed by the House, out of the appropriation for the enforcement of anti-trust laws for necessary employees at Washington, D. C.

On amendments Nos. 106 and 107: Makes a verbal correction in the text of the bill and provides for the payment of justices of the Supreme Court and judges of other courts in Washington and retired judges through the disbursing officer of the Department of Justice.

On amendment No. 108: Appropriates \$615,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$600,000, as proposed by the House, for United States district attorneys.

On amendment No. 109: Appropriates \$350,000 instead of \$325,000, as proposed by the House, and \$375,000, as proposed by the Senate, for regular assistants to United States district attorneys.

On amendment No. 110: Inserts a provision preventing the payment of double fees to the clerks of courts and United States marshals in Oregon, Washington, and Montana, and provides for them the same compensation as is paid to similar officers in other States.

On amendment No. 111: Appropriates \$558,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000, as proposed by the House, for miscellaneous expenses of United States courts.

On amendments Nos. 112, 113, and 114: Increases the pay of the farmer at the Atlanta Penitentiary from \$900 to \$1,200.

On amendments Nos. 115, 116, and 117: Strikes out the proposed increase in the compensation of the tailor at the National Training School for Boys.

On amendment No. 118: Strikes out the appropriation of \$80,000, proposed by the Senate, for the Pointe Vincent Light Station, Cal.

On amendment No. 119: Appropriates \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for changing lighting and providing additional lighting at the eastern and western entrances at Cape Cod Canal.

On amendments Nos. 120 and 121: Appropriates \$997,600, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,038,000, as proposed by the Senate, for officers and crews of lighthouse vessels and tenders and inserts a provision granting 15 days' leave of absence with pay each year to employees of the Lighthouse Service.

On amendments Nos. 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, and 132, relating to the Coast and Geodetic Survey: Appropriates \$165,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$225,000, as proposed by the Senate, for surveys and resurveys of coasts on the Pacific Ocean; strikes out authority to reimburse officers for expenses of extending relief in certain cases; strikes out the appropriation, proposed by the Senate, of \$175,000 for two new vessels; provides for an additional clerk at \$1,800 in the office force; strikes out provision for an additional clerk at \$1,000; strikes out the appropriation of \$18,600, proposed by the Senate, for a lithographic press; appropriates \$7,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,400, as proposed by the House, for the lithographic building; and appropriates \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,000, as proposed by the House, for a one-story building between the present buildings of the survey.

On amendments Nos. 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, and 142, relating to the Bureau of Fisheries: Strikes out the provi-

sion, proposed by the Senate, for a fish pathologist at \$2,500; inserts the provision, proposed by the Senate, with reference to the operations of the Bureau of Fisheries in States where there are not adequate laws for the protection of fish; appropriates \$80,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$110,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Alaska general service; appropriates \$50,000 instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, for vessels and boats for the Alaskan fishery service; authorizes any corporation, firm, or individual in Florida to donate land and water rights for the marine biological station in Florida; appropriates \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Clackamas, Oreg., fish station; appropriates \$5,000 and \$3,500, respectively, as proposed by the Senate, for the biological station at Beaufort, N. C.

On amendments Nos. 143 and 144: Appropriates \$2,649,500, as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,700,000, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of regulating immigration, and restores to the bill the provision, stricken out by the Senate, fixing the salary of the commissioner of immigration at New Orleans at \$2,900.

On amendment No. 147: Strikes out the appropriation of \$50,000, proposed by the Senate, for an Alaskan exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition.

On amendment No. 148: Appropriates \$55,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the exposition to celebrate the anniversary of the emancipation of the negro.

On amendment No. 149: Appropriates \$250,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Macdonough Memorial.

On amendment No. 150: Appropriates \$5,956, as proposed by the Senate, for the International Council for Exploration of the Sea.

On amendment No. 151: Authorizes the purchase of a power lawn mower for the Botanic Garden.

On amendment No. 152: Reappropriates for the fiscal year 1915 the appropriation of \$2,500 heretofore made for the removal of the fence around Botanic Garden.

On amendments Nos. 153, 154, 155, and 156: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, \$55,000 for the expenses of the Senate Office Building, \$5,000 for furniture for that building, \$17,500 for repairs and improvements to the Senate kitchen and restaurant; and strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, concerning the unexpended balance of the appropriation heretofore made for transportation facilities in the subways of the Capitol to the Senate and House Office Buildings.

On amendment No. 158: Strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, excepting the reports of the Attorney General from the general provision relating to the time of submitting annual reports.

On amendment No. 159: Inserts the provision, proposed by the Senate, requiring that the lowest prices paid for typewriters during the fiscal years 1913 and 1914 shall not be exceeded during the fiscal year 1915 shall apply to "substantially" the same model of machine.

On amendments Nos. 160 and 161: Limits the amount that may be prescribed for per diem rates of allowance to persons traveling on official business to \$4, as proposed by the House, instead of \$6, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, granting allowances of \$8 per day to the Board of Mediation and Conciliation and General Appraisers.

On amendment No. 162: Strikes out the provision, inserted by the Senate, regulating the compensation and per diem allowances of internal-revenue agents.

On amendment No. 163: On the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate: Accepts the verbal modification proposed in the appropriation of \$200,000 for the relief of sufferers by fire at Salem, Mass.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on amendments of the Senate as follows:

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45: Establishing customs collection districts at Kansas City, Mo., and Tampa, Fla.

Amendment No. 91: Appropriating \$237,840 for the Hot Springs Reservation at Hot Springs, Ark.

Amendment No. 92: Increasing the appropriation for Glacier National Park from \$75,000 to \$100,000.

Amendment No. 138: Appropriating \$25,000 for the fish-cultural station in Utah.

Amendment No. 145: Appropriating \$500,000 for the Government building at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition.

Amendment No. 146: Amending the law prescribing the Government exhibit to be made at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition.

JOHN J. FITZGERALD,
SWAGAR SHERLEY,
FREDK. H. GILLET,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that in the statement there is an error as to what had been done with amendment No. 149. The statement recites that the amendment appropriates \$250,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Macdonough memorial. That is an error in the printing. The agreement was for \$140,000 instead of \$250,000.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. On amendment No. 36, which made a preliminary appropriation for the construction of two revenue cutters recently authorized by law I see that the conferees have inserted as an addition to the appropriation:

And authority is hereby given to contract for the construction of said revenue cutters within the limit of cost heretofore fixed for each of them.

At whose instance was this added?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The conferees did it.

Mr. MANN. Possibly the conferees were not familiar with the law that was passed, because that itself is an authorization for the Secretary of the Treasury—

Mr. FITZGERALD. The statement was made that there was some question whether authority existed to contract for their construction under the wording of that act.

Mr. MANN. In consideration of the fact that since the gentleman from New York and I have been Members of the House there have probably been passed 40 or 50 such acts under which contracts have been let, I wondered why they discovered the necessity for inserting this.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was easier to do this than to listen to arguments.

Mr. MANN. It does not do any harm, but it is entirely useless.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was a hot night, and very late, and sooner than suffer any longer we inserted the matter, because it did no harm.

Mr. MANN. I do not want the gentleman to think it necessary when we pass one of these acts in reference to the Light-house Service or the Revenue-Cutter Service, or any other service, authorizing the Secretary to acquire such and such property, that we authorize the contract to be let subject to the appropriations to be made.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] will permit, then I suggest if the insertion of this language be necessary, hereafter when we make authorizations we must add that the proper department is thereby authorized to contract within this limit.

Mr. MANN. That would be necessary if this were necessary, but we have always treated it the other way, and they have let the contracts without difficulty.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee as to the striking out of the \$50,000 provision for the Alaskan exhibit at the San Francisco exposition. Is there any provision made anywhere for an appropriation for showing the Alaskan exhibit at the exposition in San Francisco?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is none made by the United States Government. What Alaska has done I am unable to state.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is that a complete report?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 44, 45, 91, 92, 138, 145, and 146.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to certain amendments, the numbers of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments Nos. 44, 45, 91, 92, 138—

Mr. MANN. Please stop the reading there. Let it go down to there, and there will be another motion.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then I move to further insist on amendments 41, 42, 44, 71, 92, and 98.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. On any one of those amendments?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Yes, sir; No. 91.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I modify the motion so that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 44, 45, 92, and 138.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] moves that the House further insist upon its disagree-

ment to Senate amendments 44, 45, 92, and 138. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 91.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 91.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in Senate amendment No. 91.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 91. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 91: On page 115 of the printed bill insert the following:

"Hot Springs Reservation, Hot Springs, Ark.: For labor and material required in the installation of a drainage system in the city of Hot Springs to care for storm waters from the mountains of the Hot Springs Reservation, \$237,840, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and in accordance with plans described in House Document No. 1298, Sixty-second Congress, third session."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I would like to have 15 minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield 10 minutes now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment upon which I shall insist is No. 91, page 115, House bill 7041, and which reads as follows:

"Hot Springs Reservation, Hot Springs, Ark.: For labor and material required in the installation of a drainage system in the city of Hot Springs to care for storm waters from the mountains of the Hot Springs Reservation, \$237,840, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and in accordance with plans described in House Document No. 1298, Sixty-second Congress, third session."

The hot springs referred to in the amendment are located on a Government reservation embracing between 900 and 1,000 acres of land.

The hot springs were probably visited in 1541 by De Soto, who died the following spring on the Mississippi, about 100 miles away. According to traditions the curative properties of the springs were known to the Indians long before the advent of the Spaniards. There is a tale that the various tribes battled from time to time for control of the hot waters, in which they believed the "Great Spirit" to be ever present, but that finally a truce was declared under which their benefits were extended to the sick of all tribes.

It is believed that the earliest white settlement was made about the year 1800. Dunbar and Hunter, who visited the place in December, 1804, found an open log cabin and a few huts built of split boards which had been erected by persons resorting to the springs in the hope of regaining their health. Manuel Prudhomme built a cabin there in 1807 and was joined the same year by John Perciful and Isaac Cates, who camped in the neighborhood and engaged in hunting and trapping. From this time on history is complete.

In 1832 the hot springs and the four sections of land surrounding them were, by act of Congress, set aside for the future disposal of the United States, not to be entered, located, or appropriated for any other purpose whatever, thus making the first national park reservation of the country and preserving in perpetuity, free from monopoly and commercial exploitation, the waters of the springs for the benefit of the sick.

At Hot Springs there are two great mountains, one called the East and the other the West Mountain, located on this reservation. On the East Mountain are the hot springs, and, as I remember, about 47 in number, furnishing 827,000 gallons per day. On the West Mountain, which is only across a small deep valley some two or three hundred feet wide, only cold water is found. No part of the city of Hot Springs is located on the Government reservation, except it be hotels and bathhouses built under lease from the Government. The city of Hot Springs normally contains from eighteen to twenty thousand inhabitants. The uses of the waters on this reservation, and especially the hot waters, are controlled absolutely by the Government of the United States. There are some 20 or 30 bathhouses in Hot Springs, and also a public bathhouse maintained by the Government free to the indigent poor and which is absolutely inadequate. Some of the finest bathhouses in the world, I am told, are located on the reservation, and, in addition to these, an Army and Navy hospital is maintained where our soldiers and sailors are cared for in times of sickness. This reservation and these hot waters belong to the people of the United States, and because Hot

Springs is in the district which I have the honor to represent on this floor I am expected to and am proud to look after the needs and wants of these springs to the end that suffering people may have the greatest benefit from these wonderful healing waters. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is known throughout our broad land that these springs are owned by the Government of the United States, the poor, helpless, and afflicted people from all over the country visit them in the hope of receiving a cure, and when they have reached there thousands and tens of thousands have been restored to health again. I may be also permitted to state that not only do they come there from all over our Nation, but from across the waters and from almost every country in the world.

The amendment to which I have reference was recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in 1913, and his report, together with the survey looking to the improvement embraced in the amendment, is found in House Document No. 1928, Sixty-second Congress, third session.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the improvement, in a word?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. For the information of the gentleman I had better read from the report. The recommendation to which I refer as having been made by the Secretary of the Interior is as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

"Washington, January 20, 1913.

"SIR: In the sundry civil act approved August 24, 1912, provision was made for preliminary survey of the sewer system of the city of Hot Springs, Ark., in the following terms:

"The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, at the earliest practicable date, to make a survey of the sewer system of the city of Hot Springs, abutting the Hot Springs Reservation, Ark., and to prepare plans and estimate of the cost of increasing the present storm drainage system as well as the present sanitary sewer system of the city of Hot Springs, the report of survey, including estimate of cost of the work, to be submitted to Congress as soon as practicable after the 1st day of December, 1912. The expenses incurred hereunder shall not exceed \$10,000; one-half of such expenses shall be paid out of the revenues derived from privileges and otherwise on the Hot Springs Reservation, and the other half shall be paid by the city of Hot Springs, Ark.

"By arrangement between the department and the United States Geological Survey this work was undertaken by Mr. Sledge Tatum, geographer in charge of the Rocky Mountain division of that bureau, and he has submitted his report, which, with accompanying report of J. W. Barnett, consulting engineer, and exhibits, is herewith transmitted for your consideration.

"It will be seen therefrom that an estimate is submitted in the sum of \$26,595 for labor and material in perfecting a sanitary sewer system in Hot Springs and for conducting an experimental sewer purification plant, together with alternative propositions for providing purification plants in the sum of \$70,000 and \$20,000, respectively, dependent upon the system adopted as a result of the experience obtained in experimental plant. Estimate is also submitted in the sum of \$327,540 for drainage system to care for storm waters from the mountains on the Hot Springs Reservation, which amount includes \$89,700 for extending the Hot Springs Creek Arch from its present terminus on Church Street, in the city of Hot Springs, to South Water Street, approximately the city limits. The installation of the sanitary sewer system, however, it is stated, will obviate the necessity for continuing the Hot Springs Creek Arch, with its present terminus at Church Street, because the impurities which are now flowing into the creek under the arch will be cared for by the sanitary sewer system.

"To carry into effect the recommendations embodied in the report will require appropriations by Congress as follows:

"For labor and material for perfecting a sanitary sewer system in the city of Hot Springs, the installation and operation of an experimental purification plant, and providing purification tanks in connection with such system, \$96,595.

"For labor and material required in the installation of a drainage system in the city of Hot Springs, to care for storm waters from the mountains on the Hot Springs Reservation, \$237,840.

"The sewerage system in the city of Hot Springs appears to be such as to require early measures looking to the betterment thereof, and I therefore commend your favorable consideration to the report herewith transmitted, to the end that the appropriations necessary for the completion of the work be provided by Congress."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. How far is Church Street from the Army and Navy Hospital?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I should think about three or four blocks.

Mr. PAYNE. Three or four blocks from the Army and Navy Hospital. Has this drainage canal been extended down to Church Street?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Who did that?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. The city of Hot Springs, largely, did it.

Mr. PAYNE. Not the Government?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Not the Government.

In order that you may understand, gentlemen, just why these improvements should be made and this appropriation granted I will explain to you that while the avenue between the two mountains to which I have referred is six or seven hundred feet above the sea level, yet storm waters coming down these mountains into the valley floods the main avenue in the city immediately in front of the hot springs waist deep to a man, flowing into these hotels and bathhouses on the reservation and flooding them, as also many portions of the city; and these floods come from the mountains on the reservation, causing bad waters to belch out of the now inadequate sewer system. I have photographs in my hand showing these flood conditions. People come there to be cured by these waters, and not to be made sick because of sewer conditions. If you ask me why it is that the city of Hot Springs does not take care of this situation, I reply that these people, while willing, benevolent, and patriotic, are the most burden-borne people in any city in the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Under the constitution of the State of Arkansas a municipal corporation can not lend its credit and issue bonds, but the only way by which it may be done is by the forming of an improvement district by petition of the people to tax themselves for necessary improvements. This they have done, but the tax is insufficient, and they are unable to meet this great and needed improvement; and in taxing themselves they can not tax any portion of the reservation, because it belongs to the United States Government. I say that Hot Springs every year bears a great burden, and why? The indigent, poor, and afflicted come there from all sections of the Nation, and they land in Hot Springs without food and without money, and the grand, charitable people of that city will not let them starve while they are struggling for health and for life. [Applause.]

As I now recall, without the exact data before me, about 165,000 baths were given to the poor in 1913 in these hot waters. The cures that are wrought are wonderful to think about, if you knew and had seen what I have seen. I remember last Christmas of meeting an old man, a soldier in the Civil War, who had visited Hot Springs, to be treated for rheumatism, and as he was returning home he told me of how horribly he had been afflicted and how much he had been suffering, but that he was then a well man, and, further, he said that he had been almost totally blind for many years, but that when he reached home by the blessing of these waters he would be permitted to look into the faces of grandchildren that he had never seen; that bathing in these waters had restored his eyesight. [Applause.] This is only one instance of wonderful cures derived. There are gentlemen on the floor of this House who can testify as to the great curative properties of these waters.

Should you grant this amendment and allow the improvements to be made, the water which floods the streets and the bathhouses will be conducted out of the city into the Ouachita River and will make Hot Springs what was intended when reserved—a blessing to suffering humanity. I sincerely hope that the Members of this House will cheerfully agree to this appropriation. The money will be well, wisely, and humanely expended. You must remember that charity is the paramount virtue, that all else is but “sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.”

The city of Hot Springs, which is located largely to the south and southwest from the Hot Springs Mountain, has caused to be constructed extensive sewers and has expended thousands of dollars, but which has proven to be insufficient to take care of the storm and flood waters from the mountains on the reservation, and since the Government of the United States owns this reservation I am sure our great people would

not hesitate or complain about the expenditures necessary to make these needed improvements.

Senator KENYON, of Iowa, in speaking in favor of this amendment the other day, said, “I have been there when the town was simply flooded and the sewers could not take care of the flood waters,” and further said that “this water pours down from the mountains on the Government reservation, flowing onto the streets.” Senator KENYON has often visited Hot Springs and knows whereof he speaks.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment will be agreed to. God put these waters in the mountain for sufferers, and their great uses should not be retarded.

When Christ was walking through the valleys and over the hills of Judea, visiting the homes where disease and distress prevailed, in order that He might bring relief and comfort to the sick and the sorrowing, He found in one small space a pool of water called the Pool of Bethesda. Around it gathered day by day a crowd of the afflicted, who were placed beside the pool by their friends, awaiting for the good angel to trouble the waters; and then it was that these poor invalids were dipped in to receive a blessing and a cure. As time moved on our heavenly Father saw that the increasing ages and populations would bring more afflictions to humanity and that greater opportunity for the blessings of health must be provided. The Allseeing Eye evidently scanned the great swelling brows of the mountains in Spain, France, and Italy, and the various beautiful valleys in these countries. He then looked over the immense reach of the Alps, with their snow peaks “pinnacled dim in the intense inane,” but He saw no advantageous grounds for a Bethesda in that great scope of country. He then cast his eye over the Appalachian system, that stretches from the turbid waters of the St. Lawrence River to the deep blue waves of the Gulf of Mexico. Nothing along that majestic reach of mountains engaged His attention. He then looked over the mighty and eternal grandeur and sublime solitudes of the gigantic Rockies, from where they take their beginning in the far-off ice fields of Alaska to where they lose their mighty range in the burning sands and storm-raging waters of the Straits of Magellan, but He saw no encouraging spot along that 10,000 miles of broken grandeur. He then looked over the line of the Ozarks, waving their modest green plumes from Missouri to Texas, and He discovered an unpretending little valley in Arkansas where the city of Hot Springs was afterwards located. He touched the spirit of the earthquake and the giant arose and heaved up the mountains on his shoulders and shook them apart and out came these hot waters, sparkling with radium and other medicinal qualities, inspired at every moment and in every drop by the healing presence of untiring angels, and here the lame and halt and afflicted from all over this land and from other parts of the earth come to get the healing blessing. Here the iron sinews of rheumatism are untied; here the steel fingers of paralysis are unloosed; here the agonies of the pain king are soothed and the crutches and chairs of invalids are thrown on the junk pile, while the whole valley and the mountain side are made vocal with the grand acclaims of those who have been restored to health, and from every lip comes that grandest of all doxologies:

Praise God from whom all blessings flow,
Praise Him all creatures here below;
Praise Him above, ye heavenly hosts,
Praise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

[Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE rose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I became acquainted with the classic region of Hot Springs 30 years ago, when I went down there with Casey Young, of Tennessee, and John K. Storm, of Pennsylvania, the two majority Members and myself, as an investigating committee. We were there for a whole week, and when the witnesses began to appear and tell what the obligations of the United States were to the benighted inhabitants, I was curious to know about the matter and began to ask questions. The questions were ruled out by the majority members of the committee in charge, but they afterwards relented sufficiently to allow me to cross-examine the witnesses, which I did at the three sessions each day for six days. We finally examined the last witness, and on the day when we came to make our report, although I was the minority member of the committee, I was afterwards permitted to write the report myself, which will be found somewhere in the annals of Congress, I suppose, and that report was used as the text of Mr. Holman, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to ward

off the annual raid made upon the Treasury for the improvement of Hot Springs.

Now, Hot Springs proved to be a Government reservation, not by the act of God, but growing out of a wicked lawsuit between two rival claimants who claimed to own the property; and when the case got to the Supreme Court of the United States, the Supreme Court, unfortunately for the United States, found that the United States was the owner of those reservations which my friend from Arkansas thinks were set aside by the providence of man nearly a hundred years ago for the benefit of future generations. It was a blunder if they were set aside at all, and the blunder was only found out at the end of this litigation, some 35 or 40 years ago.

When we went down there we found this condition: On one side was the Government reservation, where the springs were. On the east side of a gorge we found various bathhouses and one large hotel. On the other side were various business houses, on the west mountain, at the foot of the mountain, fronting on the Little Hot Springs River that flowed through the gorge. These were business houses, mostly occupied by gamblers at that time, who proceeded to relieve the people of the money they brought down there. There was a tradition that the Jesse James gang used to operate between Hot Springs and the Iron Mountain road, some 30 miles away, and that the James gang never attacked a party coming out of Hot Springs, because the pickings were too poor. [Laughter.] They always struck a party going into Hot Springs before the nurses and the doctors and the bathhouse people and the hotels had had any chance at them. [Laughter.]

Well, we went there to investigate the building of a new tunnel through this gorge, to take down the flood waters that came from the mountain, both from the reservation and the mountain above, where there were three large streams that joined at the Government reservation and made a heavy flow in time of great storms, when the rain rushed down the mountain. We were there primarily to investigate the complaint that the contractor was not putting the proper material into this tunnel that was there, and they tried to confine the investigation to that; but the people wanted to be heard on something else, and I wanted to hear them, and we went into everything connected with the whole business. When the Government found that it owned the reservations on each side, especially where the springs were, and the reservations where these gambling houses were on the other side of the gorge, they appointed a commission. That commission went down there and assessed the value of the improvements that had been put on by the various people who had built there supposing they were owners, and the commission made awards of the full value of the improvements. Then the Government turned around and rented these places to the former owners, with the improvements, at a nominal rental, and when we were down there the Government was doing a flourishing business in the way of building sewers and building this tunnel, which acted as a sewer for these ground-rent proprietors, including the hotel, which was also leased at a nominal rent, and the company making a mint of money all the time. That was the condition then. They wanted to extend this tunnel down to the Ouachita River. That was the dream of those people who, I suppose, wrote the beautiful poem that my friend recited as a peroration to his speech. By the way, they had a tradition down there that in the early days some immigrant in one of those prairie-schooner wagons stopped with his family at Hot Springs one evening, and after he had put out the teams, and while the family was preparing supper, he went to get a drink of water from a near-by spring. He dipped up a dipperful of it in his tin dipper and put it to his mouth, and the hot water burned his lips. He threw down the dipper and came rushing back and said, "Here, hitch up and get out of here quick. Hell ain't a mile off." [Laughter.] I do not know whether that had anything to do with the improvement that the Government has been building there at the solicitation of the inhabitants ever since or with the rule of the Jesse James gang in after years or not.

Now, they wanted to build this immense culvert on from the lower end of it down to the Ouachita River, about 6 or 7 miles away, as I remember it. They were also building an Army and Navy Hospital at the lower end of this tunnel. In the course of a few years complaint was made that the sewage went into the tunnel. The Government had no sewage. The sewage came from the tenant houses of the Government and from the residents way up the stream. Undoubtedly that polluted this Hot Springs Creek, and they said that the fumes of the sewage were coming from the lower end of the tunnel, and that it was detrimental to the Army and Navy people who were there for the curing of various disorders for which the waters seem to be a

specific. They said they must have that tunnel extended right off, to carry away the fumes. I suggested to the House then, why not let the people at Hot Springs do a little bit of the sewer and culvert construction. Of course, they had the burden of now and then a tramp who came and went into the mudhole, or the rial hole, as it was called, where this free bath has been maintained ever since. They had to take care of some few poor people who came there; but they were able to take care of them, because the rich people came there and spent their money very freely, and every man in Hot Springs, including the attendants at the bathhouses, was getting a large income out of it when I was down there, and I have not heard that any of them went into bankruptcy since then. It looked reasonable to me that they should build sewers if they did not want this sewage to go into this large town. I suggested that they build a sewer on each side of the culvert and pay for it. But they would not do that. The noisomeness of the smell was not so offensive as to induce them to put their hands into their pockets, because it did not hit the pocketbook nerve. They have kept on until they have gotten the Government to build an extension of this culvert down four blocks to Church Street, and now they want it built down to the Ouachita River, 4 or 5 miles away, to carry the sewage into that stream and not offend the fastidious noses of the people who live in Hot Springs.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I just want to correct the gentleman. He is mistaken about the residential portion of the city being above the reservation. The residential portion is not there. It is away to the south and the southwest.

Mr. PAYNE. Part of it is there and part of it is below. It was when I was there. I do not know but they have built down more below, because I have not been there in 30 years. When I was there it was above and below.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Everything has changed since then.

Mr. PAYNE. Every once in a while we get an excuse for an appropriation for Hot Springs. When they build a courthouse we have to give them the land to build it on. In order that there may be room enough for the courthouse, we have to give them a big slice of land. Whether they are building on it or not I do not know. Application was made. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] shakes his head. I do not know, but we succeeded in beating the donation of land for the courthouse and allowed the citizens of Hot Springs to pay for it themselves. The greatest financial misfortune for the Government was the discovery at the end of this lawsuit that the Government owned these reservations down there in Hot Springs. It has been a source of expense ever since, and not a source of very large income. I have not examined the matter for a long time, but when I did examine it the Government was a loser because of its ownership of these reservations. Now, it is time Congress stopped and called a halt at Hot Springs, and let the people there do these things, just as they do in every other town in the United States, build the sewerage system and pay for it themselves. We have gone to work and made a survey at the expense of the Geological Survey and made a plan for them. Let them take hold and do it, and do not give them this \$200,000 appropriation out of the Treasury of the United States, to be paid for by the rest of the people of the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Does the gentleman know that the Government is now receiving a revenue of about \$50,000 a year from this?

Mr. PAYNE. I should be very glad to know that was so. The Government ought to get a good deal more of it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. They ought to get a good deal more out of it. If they get \$50,000 a year for the next 30 years, they may get back into the Treasury what has gone out of it in the years past, when it was a burden upon the people of the United States. Let Hot Springs citizens do something for themselves. Give them a chance. It helps people so much to be required to help themselves. Nothing is so bad for a community as to be supported partly at the Government expense. It hurts citizens who are well to do the same as it hurts poor people to be helped without using their own initiative and their own energy. I hope the conferees will stick to the disagreement until the last gun is fired, and if they want a sewer system for Hot Springs let them come in with a bill by itself so that Repre-

sentatives can vote their honest convictions and not seem to be holding up an appropriation bill that ought to have been passed two months ago in order to help citizens at Hot Springs, Ark.

They have made a lot of money there out of the Government, and the town has grown up out of the Government reservation. We have sealed up the springs, built a sort of a cone over them of cement in order that no drop of hot water shall be wasted, and we have piped and conducted it to one reservoir in order to keep every drop of hot water and protect it so that it may be used by these bathhouses that are run by the people who rent them. They are not run by the Government of the United States. Fifty thousand dollars a year! If a private individual owned it, he would get a million dollars out of it, and with the same price to the ultimate consumer and without any effort. It is only another illustration of the Government trying to do business. It can not do it at a profit; it can not do it and get its expenses out of it. There is no excuse for the Government doing it in this instance, because they could surround the legislation by such safeguards that private individuals could not gouge the public as they do now. I hope that this provision will not get into the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the peculiar attitude of the people directly interested in Hot Springs, Ark., is illustrated by amendment No. 96 of the Senate. An estimate was made by the Secretary of the Treasury of \$20,000 to repair the free bathhouse at Hot Springs. At the hearing it developed that the free bathhouse was in bad condition; that the tubs needed repairing; that the plumbing was out of order, and that these repairs were essential and necessary if the free bathhouse was to be put in decent condition for use.

The House committee brought in the item of \$20,000 for that purpose. The Senate struck it out, I suppose, at the instance or suggestion of those particularly interested in these appropriations. And having stricken out that necessary item of \$20,000, they then ask us to spend \$235,000 for the building of a sewer for the people of Hot Springs.

Now, it occurs to me that these gentlemen interested in Hot Springs and the Hot Springs Reservation would be in a better position before Congress if they showed less interest in the construction of these structures which should be constructed wholly or partly by the people of Hot Springs and more interest in those things that are necessary from a congressional standpoint for the utilization of the springs by people of limited means. If there is any excuse at all for the Government maintaining the hot springs and spending a large amount of money there, it is by reason of the fact that we furnish free baths to those unable to pay for them.

This free bathhouse is utilized by many thousands of poor and afflicted people every year. It is in a shameful condition of disrepair, as all those familiar with the situation understand. And yet the friends of Hot Springs struck out this item, necessary from a governmental standpoint, and insist on our providing a sewer system for the city.

I regret that the conferees on the part of the House agreed to strike out the item of \$20,000. I understand their position, that when the people locally interested say that they do not want it they could not well insist on keeping it in. What they do want is to wait a year or so and have us appropriate a large sum of money for a new bathhouse, which is not necessary. The old bathhouse, with a reasonable appropriation, can be put in good condition.

It occurs to me that people locally interested in Hot Springs are not evidencing very good faith in the matter when they use their influence to strike out a necessary appropriation for a public purpose in order to strengthen their demand or request for a large appropriation for the purpose of an expenditure that should be borne wholly or largely by the people locally.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not think this proposition is a matter that concerns the local community, but I look upon the proposition like I look upon all questions coming before the House where the Government is involved, whether in Washington or somewhere else. I think that where the Government of the United States owns a piece of property it ought to stand in the same attitude toward that property that an individual does. I do not think that because the Government of the United States owns a piece of property in a State or a community it ought to be made a burden on that community. On the other hand, I do not believe that because it owns a piece of property it ought to be expected to do for that property any more than anybody else in the community ought to do.

As I understand the situation, it is that here are two mountains which the Government owns as a reservation. The drainage of these mountains comes down a narrow gorge that happens to be a street. The Government owns one side of the street and private individuals own the other side of the street. The sewerage is on the Government side of the street and on Government property. The sewer system is not large enough to carry off the water. When there is a heavy rainfall it comes down the side of the mountain and follows the gorge, and the sewer system is not big enough to carry the water off. That is the whole proposition—whether the Government is going to make the same contribution to carry off this water from its own land that would be made if the Government sold the land to a private individual.

If the Government does not want to own the land, it can give it away, sell it, or dispose of it in some way. If these two mountain sides were owned by a private individual, running that spring, as the Government does, to raise revenue from it, undoubtedly the State of Arkansas or the city of Hot Springs would assess that drainage area in building this sewer. To-day the sewer is on the Government side of the street and I think on Government property. The Government rents out that property and receives rentals, and the only question involved in this case, I think, is whether or not the Government should contribute as a private individual would to take care of this storm water. As to the amount of the contribution the Government should make, I know nothing about it.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. The Government already has built most of it some 30 years ago—this improvement in front of its own reservations where the hot springs are and where the property is on the other side of the street—and paid for it, and this is to be a continuation of that improvement, and not because that improvement is not adequate to carry off the water from the Government property.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not so understand it, because the pictures the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] showed me shows where the water dams up, and it is in the gorge between the Government property.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. And these pictures were taken by the Government of the United States.

Mr. PAYNE. But the gentleman says that this improvement is to be continued from the lower end of it at Church Street, southward.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know anything about where it is. I say this is a practical business proposition put to this House. It is the same thing as is involved in the District of Columbia. I say where the Government owns a large amount of property in this District it ought to contribute to the District government, and I have always stood for that proposition; and if the Government continues to hold this reservation, it is nothing but equitable and just that the Government should make a contribution toward taking care of the drainage waters. If the Government does not want the property, sell it and dispose of it.

Mr. MADDEN. Does anyone know what the total cost of the improvement would be?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman speaks of the equity of the Government making a contribution to the building of this sewage system. This is a proposition to have the Government build it, not to make any contribution. The city of Hot Springs is not participating in it at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think that is a question for the conferees to consider. I am not arguing the question of what they ought to do.

Mr. SHERLEY. But the motion is to recede and concur, which would put the Government to the expense of building the whole thing.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I want to say that the city of Hot Springs, lying far to the southwest, has its own sewage system, and it takes all of its taxes to maintain that, and the Government is throwing this water down on the city.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish it understood that I am saying what part the Government should contribute in dollars and cents, because I do not know.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is the gentleman in favor of this motion to recede and concur?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the Government ought to contribute toward it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to know if the gentleman is in favor of the motion?

Mr. BUTLER. That is what I want to know.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would really prefer the gentlemen to take the matter to the conferees and decide what is a fair proportion for the Government to pay.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the question before the House is to recede and concur in this amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suppose the gentleman from New York is not in favor of doing anything.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not in favor of doing anything unless you desire to build sewers for every municipality that can work the Government upon some specious plea for doing it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very remarkable situation in which the House finds itself. The Senate has incorporated in this bill an amendment to appropriate \$237,000 to build a sewage system for the city of Hot Springs, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], interested as we all are in keeping the appropriations within reason upon this side of the House, is supporting this motion, although he states he is not familiar with the facts. The plea upon which the request is made is that the Government owns the mountain, and that the surface waters from storms flowing down the mountain flow through the city of Hot Springs. Will anybody suggest that a private owner of any property should be compelled to build a sewer for a city because the surface water flows down the natural grade to where a sewer should be built? Twenty-eight thousand dollars will build the necessary sanitary sewer for the city of Hot Springs. Forty-six thousand dollars will build a more improved type, rather than an experimental type. But the city of Hot Springs, built upon a Government reservation, upon lots sold at a great bargain by the Government to those who located there, upon lots leased to residents of Hot Springs, and every dollar the Government gets outside of the Arlington Hotel lease is only \$7,500 a year, and until two years ago it had received for the ground rental for property upon which is a \$500,000 hotel only \$5,000, and for a few years and during the greater period of the 20-year lease only \$2,500 a year, because Congress has been so easy, because it has been so simple a matter to get money out of the Federal Treasury. To keep this rich gold mine for the benefit of the people of Hot Springs, Ark., it is now proposed, when this bill is being pressed for final enactment into law, to try and crowd into it an item of \$237,000, not for the benefit of the Government, not to perform an obligation of the Government, but to relieve the people of Hot Springs, Ark., from the obligation to provide the sewer facilities necessary for that city. Has anybody ever proposed during the three or four years that this matter has been under consideration any system, any plan, any scheme for the construction of a sewer and the apportionment of a proper charge to the Government for which it might be under obligation to pay?

A few years ago, when an item was inserted in this bill to appropriate \$10,000 for a survey to find out what was necessary, the House conferees insisted that one half of the necessary amount be paid out of the revenues of Hot Springs Reservation and the other half by the city of Hot Springs, Ark. The survey cost a little under \$7,000, and there was nearly a riot in the city of Hot Springs because it was proposed that a single dollar should be imposed upon the people of that community in order to ascertain what was required in the way of sewer facilities. This item has no business in this bill. The conferees on the part of the House—the House itself—has no information that would justify them in acting favorably upon this item. The committees of the House that have jurisdiction should take it, and if a sewer system is necessary it should be provided by the city of Hot Springs, with a Government contribution that could be worked out and reported to the House with the information necessary to justify the House in acting. We have been contending, Mr. Speaker, during this session and other sessions of the House against the imposition of such items as this. It is difficult enough to prevent these appropriation bills from being loaded down with other indefensible propositions, possibly forced through here under stress of circumstances. This item can not be justified. It is simply a naked attempt to let the Federal Government spend \$237,000 to build a sewer system for the city of Hot Springs, Ark., and relieve the people of that community of all obligations—

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD (continuing). To provide sewer facilities and make the Federal Government bear a burden that does not belong to it and far beyond what any reasonable man would suggest it should bear. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Does the gentleman realize that this is not a recommendation by the citizens of Hot Springs but by the Secretary of the Interior, and that he requests an

expenditure identically the same as that carried in the amendment to this appropriation bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know something about the history of this item. I know that there was an active and efficient young man, who was a clerk in the District Department, who visited Hot Springs Reservation a few years ago and had conversations with some of the leading citizens of Hot Springs. They presented to him a number of suggestions as to what should be done by the Federal Government. He undertook, as representing the United States Government, to pass upon what the Federal Government should do, and he recommended that \$237,000 should be appropriated, as here suggested. I have never known of a Secretary of the Interior who had any personal information about it or to make any recommendation about it. It has never been submitted in an estimate to Congress, but has been put in this bill twice by the Senate. The House rejected it on a former occasion, and I hope it will be rejected on this occasion. I desire to say to my friends on this side of the House that in the adjustment of the differences between the two Houses on this bill those representing the House endeavored to agree upon those things that could be justified before the House and the country. The bill as passed by the House carried \$110,000,000. The Senate added \$4,300,000 to it. The House receded from \$1,600,000 of items; the Senate receded from \$1,800,000 of items. There are in dispute about \$737,000. Of the items on which the House receded to the extent of \$1,600,000 I believe that at least half were for the acquisition of sites for public buildings. It is unfair of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with the little information he has on this subject, to urge the House to agree—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman's statement is unfair—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The position I take on the matter, and I think it is eminently fair, is that when the committees of this House have a problem before them where Government property is involved they should look at it exactly as if it were individual property, because that is fair to the Government and it is fair to the citizens. If there is a drainage area that extends over a very wide area of country in my community, and if water shall be on that area, it is assessed, and if the Government owns a large portion of that area it should not put all the burden on that people.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman has said that already. I have not taken the position that we should deal differently with this matter than if it were a private individual. I take the position that the people of Hot Springs, Ark., should not be permitted to use the Federal Treasury to do their work. This is not before a committee of the House; it was not before a committee of the House; no committee of the House has examined into it. The gentleman from Alabama insists that the conferees shall not agree to items in this bill over which his committee has jurisdiction. Why should he urge the conferees to agree to an item over which some other committee than the Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction? I am opposed to agreeing to this item. I can not tell—I do not know where anybody can obtain the information as to how much, if anything, the Federal Government should contribute to this sewer. I do know it should not contribute \$237,000; I do know that the people of Hot Springs, Ark., should not have this sewer system built at the expense of the Federal Government and without cost to them, and therefore I am opposing the item.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman answer this question for me?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would not interfere with the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee, but this is an appropriation bill—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, the item is not authorized.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is not necessary to have an authorization for the committee to act.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; it is.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman's committee has not jurisdiction over this question, what committee of the House has?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Committee on Public Lands, I suppose, as this is a Government reservation, but certainly the Committee on Appropriations has no jurisdiction.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is an appropriation. The gentleman from New York himself would very quickly antagonize a proposition for the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to

make a direct appropriation and not an authorization. And this is an appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In apportioning the cost between the Federal Government and the people of Hot Springs it ought to be fixed by legislation. We have no information upon which to act intelligently. We did have an estimate from the Secretary of the Treasury of \$20,000 to put in suitable condition the baths and plumbing in the public bathhouses used by the poor unfortunates who go there as charity patients to take the baths. But they do not vote in Hot Springs, Ark. The people who want this sewer do. So it was insisted that the money that should be used in putting the bathtubs and bathing places in shape, so that these poor, unfortunate derelicts who might have the benefit of the baths might take them without danger of contamination should be eliminated from the bill, and that this item, not recommended by the department, for the benefit of the people who ought to pay the cost of it, should be incorporated.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I would like to have a clear understanding of this. Does the Government take care of the water on the Government property? Is the sewer already on the Government property, and is this to construct a sewer on the Government property? Who owns the property on each side of the street?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Government.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. The Government owns on both sides of the street?

Mr. FITZGERALD. But some of it has been sold, or some of it has been leased under ground leases.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Then private individuals live on one side of this sewer?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Some of the baths are operated by the Government and some, I understand, by the lessees from the Government. On the other side is property owned by other persons. Now, a septic sewer, that would relieve the situation of all the offensiveness, can be built, one kind for \$28,000 and the other for \$46,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. BUTLER. Is not this legislation; and if the Committee on Appropriations had reported it to the House, would it not have been subject to a point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is legislation, of course, and has no business here.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the total cost of the proposed improvement?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Two hundred and thirty-seven thousand dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. And what is the proportion of the property owned by the Government as it relates to the whole property to be benefited by the improvement?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know.

Mr. MADDEN. Does anybody know?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I can tell you.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I decline to yield for that purpose.

Mr. MADDEN. Then nobody knows what the proper proportion of the Government contribution toward this improvement would be?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the total proceeds of the sale of lots amounted to \$82,000, and that was permanently appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the bathhouses.

Mr. MADDEN. So, as a matter of fact, there is not anybody connected with this case who can tell what the proportion of the city of Hot Springs should be and whether there should be any proportion levied against the Federal Government at all?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not been able to obtain that information in the examination I have made of the question.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, until we do obtain that information, the House surely ought not to approve this project.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has four minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman from New York yield to me a few minutes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield two minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WINGO. Now, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] I want to state that the reservation of the Government now comprises 1,100 acres. The greater part of the city of Hot Springs is not now, nor was it ever, on what is known now as the Government reservation. The gentleman from New York speaks about the conditions that existed 30 years ago. Those conditions may

have existed then, but do not exist now. At that time it was a straggling village of a few thousand people, while to-day it is a city of 20,000 or 30,000 people, and each year 165,000 poor people visit there to take advantage of these wonderful curative waters. This is not a proposition to build a sewer system for the city of Hot Springs, and any man who knows the facts or who will take the public document that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] had in his hand a moment ago and study it, and study the map there, will see that this is a proposition to provide a storm sewer for the Government reservation and not for the city of Hot Springs.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield to me for a second?

Mr. WINGO. For just a second.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I desire to state to the House that there used to be a creek down this valley. Will the gentleman refer to that?

Mr. WINGO. The culvert that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] referred to was the one the Government built along the stream, the narrow gorge that lies between the two Government properties, to take care of a creek that ran through there, and not to take care of the sewage. The greater part of Hot Springs has been built up since the gentleman from New York was there. The greater part of the residences of the city lie down to the south and west of the reservation, and that part has its own sewerage system. This proposition is that the Government shall build this sewer to take care of the waters that come from the Hot Springs Reservation, on Government property. The gentleman says there is no sewage that comes from the Government property. The Government has an Army and Navy Hospital, and the boys from the Army and Navy are treated there. Every year thousands go to the Army and Navy Hospital and are taken care of at the Government buildings on the side of the East Mountain. Drives have been laid out, and the curb and surface drains have caused the water to shoot down with great force into the street in the narrow gorge, on one side of which is entirely Government property and on the other side mostly Government property; and the water rushes out there in time of rain from the Government reservation of 1,100 acres, so that the water floods what? The residences? No. The business houses? Yes, to some extent; but the greater part of the property that is damaged is the property of the United States Government bathhouses on which we have spent thousands of dollars in years past.

Ah, but the gentleman says there has been no proper estimate. There has been a proper estimate by the Interior Department. This is a business proposition for the Government to take care of its own property.

Oh, they say, it is not proper for the Government to make this appropriation. The Government is almost the only party to be protected. Instead of the Government bearing this expense, if the private property only were assessed, it would amount to confiscation. True, these waters that run down there do flow out into some part of the city. That is true. The water does flow until it reaches a higher grade, reaching into some parts of the business district. It is simply a proposition as to whether or not the Government will take care of its own property and protect that property, and incidentally the business section of the city, from the storm waters that flow from the reservation. Hot Springs does not ask for this as a matter of favor or charity, but as a matter of justice. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House is confronted with the proposition to recede on an item for nearly a quarter of a million dollars for a sewer system which the gentleman from Arkansas says is not for the benefit of the city of Hot Springs, but which we, the members of the Committee on Appropriations, who have investigated the matter from year to year, say is for the benefit of the city of Hot Springs.

Now, the very fact of that dispute shows the lack of wisdom in passing such an appropriation upon a supply bill with no more investigation than can be had here. Here is a Government reservation. Men build a town alongside of it, and then they say that because they are alongside of it and there is surface drainage from the Government land, that imposes an obligation on the Government to build a sewer to take care of such drainage waters.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I have but a few minutes. That is a proposition I will not agree to. The gentleman from Alabama

[Mr. UNDERWOOD] undertakes to make a comparison between the District of Columbia and the Hot Springs Reservation. There is no real, just basis for such a comparison. But if there was, it would hardly be a good one, because the Government of the United States has rarely got its equal rights when it came to dealing with the citizens of the District of Columbia. I fear that the gentleman from Alabama is qualifying himself for service in that other body, whose chief work is not in the interest of economy; and I ask this body, which is charged with the duty of holding down expenditures—I ask those on this side, who have made some claim to economical tendencies—to hesitate before we agree to lay on the Government the entire cost of an elaborate sewerage system, a system more elaborate than is necessary, even if one is built. I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The vote is on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] to recede and concur.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. WINGO. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] demands a division. Those in favor of receding and concurring will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Forty-three gentlemen have arisen in the affirmative. Those opposed will stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Eighty-nine gentlemen have arisen in the negative. On this vote the yeas are 43 and the noes are 89.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] makes the point that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and—

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the point of no quorum and demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. MANN. The Speaker has declared that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is too slow.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] to recede from the House disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 91 and concur therein will, when their names are called, vote yea; those opposed will vote nay.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 67, nays 170, answered "present" 4, not voting, 192, as follows:

YEAS—67.

Abercrombie	Collier	Hawley	Oldfield
Allen	Curry	Hayden	Park
Ansberry	Deitrick	Heflin	Rainey
Ashbrook	Dent	Johnson, Ky.	Raker
Baker	Diffenderfer	Johnson, Wash.	Reed
Bathrick	Driscoll	Kahn	Roberts, Nev.
Bell, Cal.	Evans	Keating	Stephens, Cal.
Blackmon	Fergusson	Kettner	Stout
Broussard	Ferris	Kindel	Taggart
Burgess	Floyd, Ark.	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Taylor, Ark.
Burke, Wis.	Garrett, Tenn.	McKellar	Taylor, Colo.
Burnett	Glittins	MacDonald	Ten Eyck
Campbell	Goeke	Morgan, Okla.	Underwood
Caraway	Goodwin, Ark.	Mulkey	Watkins
Carter	Hardy	Murdock	Williams
Church	Harris	Nolan, J. I.	Wingo
Clark, Fla.	Harrison	O'Hair	

NAYS—170.

Adamson	Claypool	Flood, Va.	Hill
Aiken	Cline	Fordney	Holland
Alexander	Connelly, Kans.	Foster	Howell
Anderson	Conry	Fowler	Hull
Avis	Covington	Francis	Johnson, Utah
Bailey	Cox	French	Kelley, Mich.
Baltz	Cramton	Gard	Kelly, Pa.
Barkley	Cullop	Garner	Kennedy, Iowa
Barnhart	Danforth	Garrett, Tex.	Kent
Bartholdt	Decker	Gillett	Key, Ohio
Barton	Dickinson	Gilmore	Kirkpatrick
Beakes	Dillon	Godwin, N. C.	Konop
Booher	Dixon	Good	Korbly
Borchers	Donovan	Graham, Ill.	La Follette
Britten	Doolittle	Gray	Langley
Brodbeck	Doremus	Green, Iowa	Lee, Ga.
Brumbaugh	Doughton	Greene, Mass.	Lee, Pa.
Bryan	Dupré	Greene, Vt.	Lenroot
Buchanan, Tex.	Edmonds	Hamlin	Lewis, Md.
Burke, S. Dak.	Esch	Haugen	Lieb
Butler	Falson	Hay	Lindbergh
Byrnes, S. C.	Falconer	Helgesen	Lloyd
Byrns, Tenn.	Fitzgerald	Helm	Logue
Carr	FitzHenry	Hensley	Loneragan

McAndrews	Patton, Pa.	Sharp	Talcott, N. Y.
McCoy	Payne	Sherley	Tavener
McKenzie	Peters, Mass.	Sherwood	Thacher
Madden	Peters, Me.	Sinnott	Towner
Maguire, Nebr.	Peterson	Sisson	Townsend
Mann	Phelan	Sloan	Treadway
Mapes	Platt	Small	Tribble
Mondell	Quin	Smith, Idaho	Tuttle
Montague	Ragsdale	Smith, Minn.	Underhill
Moore	Reilly, Wis.	Smith, N. Y.	Volstead
Morrison	Rogers	Smith, Saml. W.	Walsh
Moss, Ind.	Rouse	Stedman	Watson
Moss, W. Va.	Rubey	Steenerson	Webb
Neely, W. Va.	Rucker	Stephens, Miss.	Whaley
Norton	Russell	Stephens, Tex.	Witherspoon
Oglesby	Scott	Stevens, Minn.	Woodruff
Padgett	Seldomridge	Stevens, N. H.	Young, N. Dak.
Page, N. C.	Sells	Stone	
Palmer	Shackleford	Talbott, Md.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Clancy	Moon	Sims	Slemp
--------	------	------	-------

NOT VOTING—192.

Adair	Elder	Jones	Post
Ainey	Estopinal	Keister	Pou
Anthony	Fairchild	Kennedy, Conn.	Powers
Aswell	Farr	Kennedy, R. I.	Prouty
Austin	Fess	Kless, Pa.	Rauch
Barchfeld	Fields	Kinhead, N. J.	Rayburn
Bartlett	Finley	Kitchin	Reilly, Conn.
Beall, Tex.	Frear	Knowland, J. R.	Riordan
Bell, Ga.	Gallagher	Kreider	Roberts, Mass.
Borland	Gallivan	Lafferty	Rothermel
Bowdle	Gardner	Langham	Rupley
Brockson	George	Lazaro	Sabath
Brown, N. Y.	Gerry	L'Engle	Saunders
Brown, W. Va.	Gill	Leshner	Scully
Browne, Wis.	Glass	Lever	Shreve
Browning	Goldfogle	Levy	Slayden
Bruckner	Gordon	Lewis, Pa.	Smith, J. M. C.
Buchanan, Ill.	Gorman	Lindquist	Smith, Md.
Bulkley	Goulden	Linthicum	Smith, Tex.
Burke, Pa.	Graham, Pa.	Lobeck	Sparkman
Calder	Gregg	Loft	Stafford
Callaway	Griest	McClellan	Stanley
Candler, Miss.	Griffin	McGillcuddy	Stephens, Nebr.
Cantor	Gudger	McGuire, Okla.	Stringer
Cantrill	Guernsey	McLaughlin	Summers
Carew	Hamill	Mahan	Sutherland
Carlin	Hamilton, Mich.	Maher	Switzer
Cary	Hamilton, N. Y.	Manahan	Taylor, Ala.
Casey	Hammond	Martin	Taylor, N. Y.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hardwick	Merritt	Temple
Coady	Hart	Metz	Thomas
Connolly, Iowa	Hayes	Miller	Thompson, Okla.
Cooper	Helvering	Mitchell	Thomson, Ill.
Copley	Henry	Morgan, La.	Vare
Crisp	Hinds	Morin	Vaughan
Crosser	Hinebaugh	Mott	Vollmer
Dale	Hobson	Murray, Mass.	Walker
Davenport	Houston	Murray, Okla.	Wallin
Davis	Howard	Neeley, Kans.	Walters
Dershem	Hoxworth	Nelson	Weaver
Dies	Hughes, Ga.	O'Brien	Whitacre
Donohoe	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Leary	White
Dooling	Hulings	O'Shaunessy	Willis
Drukker	Humphrey, Wash.	Paige, Mass.	Wilson, Fla.
Dunn	Humphreys, Miss.	Parker	Wilson, N. Y.
Eagan	Igoe	Patten, N. Y.	Winslow
Eagle	Jacoway	Plumley	Woods
Edwards	Johnson, S. C.	Porter	Young, Tex.

So the motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 91 and concur in the same was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the remainder of this session:

Mr. GLASS with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. METZ with Mr. WALLIN.

Until further notice:

Mr. ADAIR with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. AUSTIN.

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. BOWDLE with Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin.

Mr. BULKLEY with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. CASEY with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. CANTRELL with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. DERSHEM with Mr. FARR.

Mr. DONOHUE with Mr. FESS.

Mr. ELDER with Mr. MILLER.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. FREAR.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi with Mr. KLESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. IGOE with Mr. HINEBAUGH.

Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. HULINGS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.
 Mr. LESHER with Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma.
 Mr. LEVER with Mr. MANAHAN.
 Mr. LEVY with Mr. LAFFERTY.
 Mr. MITCHELL with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts with Mr. PORTER.
 Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. WOODS.
 Mr. WEAVER with Mr. RUPLEY.
 Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. TEMPLE.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. THOMSON of Illinois.
 Mr. REILLY of Connecticut with Mr. WALTERS.
 Mr. RAUCH with Mr. VARE.
 Mr. MCGILLICUDDY with Mr. GUERNSEY.
 Mr. BORLAND with Mr. ANTHONY.
 Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. WILLIS.
 Mr. WALKER with Mr. SUTHERLAND.
 Mr. STRINGER with Mr. PROUTY.
 Mr. SMITH of Texas with Mr. NELSON.
 Mr. SIMS with Mr. MORIN.
 Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. KEISTER.
 Mr. BROWN of New York with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
 Mr. ASWELL with Mr. CARY.
 Mr. RUCHANAN of Illinois with Mr. COOPER.
 Mr. GORMAN with Mr. McLAUGHLIN.
 Mr. LOBECK with Mr. POWERS.
 Mr. SAUNDERS with Mr. WINSLOW.
 Mr. SAEATH with Mr. SWITZER.
 Mr. LAZARO with Mr. PARKER.
 Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. AINEY.
 Mr. HARDWICK with Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND.
 Mr. HUGHES of Georgia with Mr. MERRITT.
 Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. LANGHAM.
 Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 Mr. ROTHERMEL with Mr. HAYES.
 Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. CLANCY with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
 Mr. THOMAS with Mr. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. VAUGHAN with Mr. SHREVE.
 Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.
 Mr. DALE with Mr. MARTIN.
 Mr. HENRY with Mr. HINDS.
 Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. J. M. C. SMITH.
 Mr. NEELEY of Kansas with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present, and the Doorkeeper will unlock the doors. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 91.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 145.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 145.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] makes a preferential motion, that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 145 and concur in the same.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask that that amendment be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 145: On page 167 of the printed bill insert the following:

"PANAMA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION.

"Building to install the Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition: For the construction of a suitable building in that part of the reservation of the United States known as the Presidio of San Francisco, State of California, in which the Government Exhibit Board, created by the sundry civil appropriation act approved June 23, 1913, shall install, display, and safeguard the exhibit of the Government of the United States at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, \$500,000: *Provided*, That the said building shall be so located and planned and shall be of such a permanent character as will make it available and useful for military purposes of the United States after the close of the said exposition, and shall be on such general plan and design and in such location as shall be approved by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That the said building shall be erected under the authority of the Secretary of War, by contract or otherwise, as he may direct: *Provided further*, That not exceeding \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended from the appropriation made herein, on the approval and authority of the Secretary of War, for entertaining the officers and representatives of foreign governments who may attend and participate in the Panama-Pacific International

Exposition in consequence of the invitation of the President of the United States, extended in pursuance of the authority of Congress.

"The provisions contained in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914,' which provides for the participation of the United States in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, be amended as follows: Under the head of 'To provide for the participation of the United States in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition,' the paragraph on page 81, which reads as follows: 'The President of the United States is authorized to detail three civilian officers or employees from the executive departments as members of a commission which is hereby constituted as the National Exposition Commission, one of said commissioners, who shall be the chairman of said commission, shall be detailed from the Department of State. Vacancies in said commission shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments. Each commissioner shall receive in addition to his original compensation his actual necessary traveling expenses and an allowance of \$10 per day in lieu of subsistence. Said commissioners may appoint a secretary at \$2,500 per annum, and the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended for clerical, office, and other necessary and actual expenses of said commission,' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'The President of the United States is authorized to detail two civilian officers or employees from the executive departments, also one to be appointed from civil life, as members of the commission which is hereby constituted as the National Exposition Commission; one of said commissioners, who shall be the chairman of said commission, shall be detailed from the Department of State, the commissioner appointed from civil life to receive a salary at the rate of \$5,000 per annum until the exposition closes. Vacancies in said commission shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments. Each commissioner detailed as aforesaid shall receive, in addition to his original compensation, necessary traveling expenses and an allowance of \$10 per day in lieu of subsistence while on duty in San Francisco. Said commissioners may appoint a secretary at \$2,500 per annum, and the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended for clerk hire and actual expenses of said commission.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much time does the gentleman want, five minutes?

Mr. KAHN. There are quite a number of gentlemen who would like to be heard upon the motion. I would like about 40 minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Make it 30 minutes on a side. There are some very important matters yet to come up.

Mr. KAHN. I suggest 40 minutes. I have had numerous requests for time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Make it 35 minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Thirty-five minutes on a side, then.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent that there be 35 minutes on a side on the pending motion, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and one-half by myself, and that at the end of that time the previous question be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that debate on these two motions be confined to 35 minutes on a side, one-half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], and that at the end of the 70 minutes the question be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is recognized for 35 minutes. If no one wishes to speak, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. KAHN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. UNDERHILL].

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is about three years and a half since Congress, by giving the stamp of its approval, located the Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco, and in accordance with this action the President of the United States extended an invitation to the nations of the world to participate in this exposition.

In the sundry civil bill a year ago an appropriation of \$500,000 was made for the preparation of a Government exhibit at this exposition, and ever since that time the work of preparing the exhibit has been going on under the auspices of officials designated by the President. The importance of making a suitable exhibit by the United States is self-evident. It is this country that has extended the invitation to foreign powers. The United States is, in a sense, the host of all foreign countries and of all foreigners who bring to this land their wares, their curios, and their objects of art for the education and enlightenment of all who may attend the exposition.

March 31 last the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, transmitted to Congress a letter from the Secretary of State calling attention to the inadequate arrangements for housing the Government exhibit. Secretary Bryan stated that in order to be imposing the exhibit should be collected under one roof, and the statements of Secretary Bryan were indorsed by the President, and the entire matter referred to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

In accordance with these suggestions I was directed by the committee to confer with Secretary Bryan and Secretary Garrison, and two hearings were held upon the proposed bill, which was duly introduced into the House and is now upon the calendar.

A large part of the Panama-Pacific Exposition is to be located upon the Presidio, a Government reservation where the military department of the Pacific is at present located. Ever since the war in the Philippines it has been found necessary by the War Department to make this military department at San Francisco the largest and possibly the most important in the United States. The buildings for that purpose are inadequate, and it was through the cooperation of the Secretaries of State and War that the idea was suggested that a suitable building could be provided by the United States in which to house its exhibit at the Panama-Pacific Exposition, and yet the building be so constructed as to make it available for the purposes of the Department of War after the close of the exposition.

Secretary Garrison, when he appeared before the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, emphasized the necessity of more accommodations for the military arm of the Government at the Presidio. He stated that at present the buildings occupied by part of the soldiers were little better than shacks, and except for the favorable climate Congress would have been called upon to provide appropriations for permanent buildings on the Presidio long ago.

The attention of the committee was called to the number of foreign Governments that had accepted invitations to make an exhibit on this occasion. A majority of the States will have buildings commensurate with their importance, and altogether an estimate of \$50,000,000 is made as the amount that will be invested in the great exposition of 1915. This country should not be guilty of parsimony in a great enterprise of this kind. The richest country in the world should be properly represented at what is expected to be the greatest exposition of modern times. [Applause.]

In view of the fact that the bill reported by the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions has not been reached upon the calendar, I append the bill reported from the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions and the report on same:

A bill (H. R. 16327) to provide an appropriation for the erection of a building within which to install a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition.

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to enable the said Government Exhibit Board created by the sundry civil appropriation act approved June 23, 1913, properly to install, display, and safeguard the exhibit of the Government of the United States at the Panama-Pacific Exposition the sum of \$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the erection in that part of the reservation of the United States known as the Presidio, which may be used in connection with the said Panama-Pacific International Exposition, of a suitable building in which to install, display, and safeguard the said exhibits of the Government of the United States: *Provided, however*, That the said building shall be so planned and of such permanent character as will make it available and useful for military purposes of the United States after the close of the said exposition, and shall be on such general plan and design as shall be approved by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of War: *And provided further*, That the said building shall be erected under authority of the Secretary of War, by contract or otherwise, as he may direct.

[House Report No. 686, Sixty-third Congress, second session.]

GOVERNMENT BUILDING, PANAMA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. UNDERHILL, from the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, submitted the following report, to accompany H. R. 16327:

The Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, having had under consideration a bill to provide an appropriation for the erection of a building within which to install a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, report the same with the recommendation that it do pass with the following amendments:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "Pacific," insert the word "International."

On page 1, line 8, after the letters "tion," strike out all the rest of the line and lines 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 to and including the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof the words, "the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to erect by contract or otherwise."

On page 2, line 1, after the letters "ing," insert the following: "in that part of the reservation of the United States known as the Presidio, at a cost not to exceed \$500,000."

On page 2, line 8, after the word "War," strike out the rest of the line and all of lines 9 and 10.

Amend the title so that it will read, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to erect a building within which to install a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, and for other purposes."

On April 2, 1914, the President of the United States sent a message to the Congress, transmitting the statement of the Secretary of State, recommending an appropriation for the erection of a building within which to install a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. The message of the President and the statement of the Secretary of State are as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending an appropriation of \$500,000 for the erection of a building within which to install, display, and safeguard at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition at San Francisco the Government exhibit authorized by the sundry civil appropriation act of June 23, 1913.

As pointed out by the Secretary of State, many of the Governments officially invited guests by the United States to participate in the exposition are erecting buildings within which to house their exhibits at the exposition. The Government of the United States should not be behind these in appropriately providing for its national exhibit.

I commend the recommendation to the favorable consideration of Congress.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, March 31, 1914.

The President:

The sundry civil appropriation act approved June 23, 1913, appropriates \$500,000 for the purpose of inaugurating, installing, maintaining, and returning a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition to open at San Francisco next year, of such articles and materials as illustrate the functions and administrative faculty of the Government of the United States tending to demonstrate the nature and growth of our institutions, their adaptation to the wants of the people, and the progress of the Nation in the arts of peace and war; and authorized the President to provide for the collection and exhibition of such articles and materials under the direction of a board which is created by the act, to which is imposed the duty of determining the nature and character and extent of the exhibits to be made and which is charged with the collection, purchase, preparation, safe-keeping, and exhibition and return of such articles and materials as the board may decide shall be exhibited. But no provision is made by that act or by any previous or subsequent act for the erection of a suitable building within which these exhibits may be installed, displayed, and safeguarded.

The policy of the Federal Government to support the exposition was fixed by the joint resolution of February 15, 1911, which requested the President of the United States to invite all the nations of the earth to participate therein, and the invitation extended in pursuance thereof by the President to all the nations of the earth to take part in the exposition gives to the exposition in the minds of the foreign Governments an official character.

Twenty-seven of these Governments have responded favorably to the invitation, most of which have buildings in course of construction in which to house their exhibits, while many of our States have signified their intention to take a worthy part in the exposition and have made provision for the erection of State buildings. Of the Governments which have not yet accepted the invitation, few have actually declined, while others are awaiting the assembling of their legislative bodies for appropriate action.

I deem it important that the Government of the United States should make at the exposition such a display as will be commensurate with the international scope and importance of the exposition and as will comport with the dignity and standing of the United States. This can not be done, and the exhibit would be of little value if scattered through the exposition buildings, space in which I understand is already insufficient for individual exhibitors. To be imposing it should be collected together under one roof. The site set apart for the building is on the Government reservation in the Presidio. A building there erected by the Government could no doubt be utilized after the exposition for Army uses and it should be constructed with that end in view.

The sum of \$500,000 is not too large for this purpose, and I recommend that Congress be requested to appropriate that amount for the erection of the building.

Respectfully submitted.

W. J. BRYAN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, March 30, 1914.

Your committee is satisfied that a building of the character contemplated by this legislation ought to be erected at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. Twenty-six or twenty-seven foreign Governments have accepted the invitation of the President of the United States to participate at said exposition. Each of these Governments will construct a building for the housing of its exhibits. As the Government of the United States is the host at this exposition, it is but fitting and proper that our Government should also have a building wherein its exhibits can be displayed to the best possible advantage. Unless a building such as is contemplated by this bill is constructed, the exhibits of the United States Government will be scattered through a number of buildings and the very purpose of assembling the Government exhibit so that it may be an object lesson to the citizens of the United States as well as visitors from abroad will be destroyed. In expositions that have been held heretofore, the Government display has invariably been one of the main attractions. Your committee has been informed that the exhibit contemplated by the commission authorized by the sundry civil appropriation act of June 23, 1913, will be the most comprehensive and instructive that has ever been assembled. It would be a pity to scatter it through half a dozen or more buildings. The citizens of the Republic ought to know the many activities in which the Government is engaged and those activities ought to be exhibited in the most comprehensive and instructive manner. We feel that they can be shown to much better advantage under one roof in a building such as is contemplated by this bill, as otherwise many of them will be lost sight of by a large part of the visitors and the very purposes of a Government exhibit will be destroyed.

In addition to these foreign Governments nearly all of the States of the Union have accepted the invitation to be represented and will put up their own buildings to house their exhibits and provide places of assembly for the citizens of the various Commonwealths.

The building contemplated by this legislation will be of a permanent character and will be so constructed that it can be used by the War Department when the exposition is over. The Secretary of War appeared before your committee and pointed out that he believed a proper building for exhibition purposes could be so constructed that after the close of the exposition it could be converted into a barracks. He pointed out that it is absolutely necessary to erect barracks at San Francisco for one regiment, because the troops there are now living in most curious buildings that look like soup kitchens temporarily turned into living apartments. He called attention to the fact that they are long, low-framed buildings, built of cheap lumber, and that if it were not for the splendid climate of California they would probably not have been able to stand as long as they have. He said frankly that in the climate of the eastern section of this country they would not have stood so long. The Secretary of War further stated that it will be impossible to go on for many more years without erecting a barracks for infantry at the Presidio; that it has been the policy of the department in recent years to put up one substantial building, mostly of some kind of concrete, and housing just as many men as can be housed under the one roof, because that saves in utility and upkeep.

In view of the fact that the buildings that are used at present for barracks by the enlisted men of the Army in the Presidio are entirely inadequate for the purposes for which they are being used, and believing that the construction of the building authorized by this bill will serve a useful and permanent purpose, and in further view of the fact that the legislation is recommended by the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the War Department, your committee feels that the building should be authorized by the House of Representatives.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be notified when I have used five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAY). The Chair will notify the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, when it was proposed to hold an exposition to commemorate the opening of the Panama Canal, two cities in the United States competed for the opportunity to hold the exposition, San Francisco and New Orleans. New Orleans asked that \$1,000,000 be appropriated for an exhibit and for buildings for a Government exhibit. San Francisco pledged itself that it would not ask a dollar from the Federal Government for a building or for an exhibit. On January 31, 1911, when the question was before the House as to whether San Francisco or New Orleans should be selected, Mr. KAHN said:

California did not propose at any time to come to the Congress for a single dollar of appropriation for this exposition. The legislature of our State on the 23d of January last unanimously passed a joint resolution pledging the honor of the people of California never to ask for a single dollar in aid of this international exposition, and the people of California keep their faith.

I was one of the Members of this House who voted for San Francisco upon the strength of those pledges. Subsequently the House had a bill before it to appropriate \$2,000,000 urged by the people of California for a governmental exhibit for buildings and for an elaborate commission. That bill was defeated in this House. Later the Senate incorporated in the sundry civil bill an item appropriating \$1,500,000 for a Government exhibit for buildings and a commission. The House voted on three separate propositions—to give \$1,000,000, to give \$750,000, and to give \$500,000. It voted down the first two propositions, but voted to appropriate \$500,000 for a Government exhibit, providing a board to consist of officials of the Government to be detailed for that purpose, eliminating all paid commissioners, and providing in the law that the exposition company should furnish the necessary building or buildings to house the Government exhibit. The board created under that act has been appointed. It has been at work, has planned and designed the Government exhibits, the space has been allotted for them in various buildings, and these exhibits are being prepared to be sent when the time comes for the exhibition in San Francisco.

The Senate has incorporated in this bill an amendment providing \$500,000 for a building, which can not be constructed in time to house the exhibits for the opening of the fair, on the pretense that a building suitable for military purposes on the Presidio will be suitable for exhibition purposes. It also provides for the appointment of a commissioner from civil life, at a compensation of \$5,000 a year, and that \$50,000 of the \$500,000 shall be available for the entertainment of distinguished persons who are to visit the fair. Although California promised never to ask for a dollar, pledged its sacred honor by resolution of the legislature, by promises of Representatives on the floor of this House, they have obtained \$500,000 for Government exhibits, \$104,000 for the entertainment of officers of visiting fleets at Hampton Roads, Panama, and San Francisco, \$200,000 for United States customs and other officials at the fair, and having thus already obtained \$800,000 in appropriations, it now has the effrontery to try and induce Congress to appropriate \$500,000 more.

I voted for San Francisco as a place to hold the exposition in good faith, and replied upon the statements made. I believe that we should compel the people interested to live up to their pledges. There is no excuse for appropriating this \$500,000. A building that will be suitable for exhibition purposes will be ridiculous and useless as barracks and quarters for troops. This building, if erected, unless it is to be a permanent exhibition building, will have to be destroyed. It will not be suitable for the exposition and also for the Army. It seems to me, in view of the records that have been made, in view of the promises that have been made, in view of the assurances, in view of the action Congress has taken, this Democratic House should not be induced by any specious plea to do anything to relieve the exposition company of its obligations, and appropriate this money. I hope the House will refuse to appropriate the \$500,000. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. I. NOLAN].

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has called the attention of the House to the fact that certain pledges were made at the time Congress adopted the resolution that carried with it the official indorsement of the Government of the United States to the city of San Francisco to hold the Panama-Pacific Exposition to commemorate the completion of the Panama Canal. The city of San Francisco and the State of California made the pledges in good faith. Many things have happened in that State, as they have all over the country, since that time over which the people in California and San Francisco have had no control. Our people intended as far as they were able to carry out their pledges, and have done so.

In the case of permanent buildings the exposition had to forego a number of the permanent buildings contemplated at the time this exposition was first put under way that were intended for the permanent use of the citizens of San Francisco after the exposition closed. Every way in which the company could economize has been taken advantage of, so that every obligation would be fulfilled. We are asking the Congress of the United States at this time to provide \$500,000 for a permanent building, \$450,000 to be used for a permanent building and \$50,000 for the entertainment of distinguished visitors. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations states that it is hardly possible to construct a building to house the Government's exhibit that will be suitable for the purposes of the War Department after the exposition closes. I call your attention to the Senate amendment, which provides—

That the said building shall be so located and planned and shall be of such a permanent character as will make it available and useful for military purposes of the United States after the close of the said exposition, and shall be on such general plan and design and in such location as shall be approved by the Secretary of War.

It is not within the province of the exposition company to say where it shall be located, what its design shall be, but it is for the Secretary of War to select a location and approve the design for War Department purposes, for barracks and quarters to be used by one of the greatest military reservations the United States has after the exposition closes. This is not the ordinary appropriation for exposition purposes. The building is to be of a permanent character, owned by the United States and placed on the Government reservation.

The Secretary of War will have entire jurisdiction over the location and the plans and designs of that structure. It is not likely that the Secretary of War, after appearing before the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, favoring this appropriation, is going to permit the War Department to be used for an ulterior purpose. It not only has the indorsement of the Secretary of War, but has the indorsement of the Secretary of State, and a special message was sent to this House by the President of the United States favoring this appropriation, and the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions has reported that bill favorably, and it is now pending on the calendar. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations says that space has been allotted for the Government exhibit in different parts of the exposition grounds. Is national pride not to be taken into consideration in this matter? When the people of this country and the people of the world go to visit San Francisco in 1915, is not the Nation in duty bound to provide a suitable place for its exhibit, as well as to provide a suitable exhibit? The exposition company is doing all it possibly can. Conditions have not been of the very best since 1907. When we were about recovering from the disaster of 1906 the panic of 1907 came along, and when we got the official sanction of the Government to hold the exposition we were hopeful that financial and industrial conditions would be so good that the people of the city and State would respond as Californians always do. Unfortunately the opposite has been the case, and the company and the people generally have contributed as generously as present conditions will permit.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, was not public pride just as great when we made the original appropriation as it is now?

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Yes; but conditions have changed, as I have stated. Otherwise this and other appropriations would not have been asked. In this instance the Government of the United States is asking Congress to act.

Mr. BUTLER. I will ask the gentleman to tell me what those conditions are. I voted for this original proposition with the idea that no money was to be appropriated, and I will probably vote for this, but I would like to know what the change is.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. The Secretary of War has stated that this building can be used for Government purposes, and it is intended it shall be used for Government purposes, and the plans and designs for that building will be such that the War

Department, at a small cost, will have suitable accommodations for the Army at the Presidio Military Reservation.

Nearly all of the foreign Governments, with the exception of England and Germany, have accepted our invitation to participate at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, for the purpose of celebrating the completion of the Panama Canal, and in every instance have made an appropriation, not alone for an exhibit but for an appropriate building characteristic of the country itself and its arts and industries, and also to house the exhibits of its citizens.

Over 30 States of this Union have accepted the invitation to participate; have selected their sites; made appropriations for suitable buildings, which are now in course of construction.

Why should we, as a nation, when we invite the world to participate, hesitate about making an appropriation for a suitable building in which to house our exhibit so that Americans generally when they visit the exposition might take pride in their own participation?

The President of the United States and the Secretary of State, realizing that this Nation should be suitably represented, have asked Congress in this instance to act. Notwithstanding the statements of some of the gentlemen on the floor that promises were made that no appropriations should be asked for, the Chief Executive, understanding the situation, has given his approval to the proposition now before the House.

The military reservation of San Francisco will derive benefits in the way of permanent improvements that will save this Government hundreds of thousands of dollars, not alone in the filling in of lands, the estimated cost of which was \$300,000, but in the permanent beautification of the grounds in the matter of parks, flower beds, beautiful trees, and well-built roads. All these improvements will be permanent and remain the property of the Government after the exposition closes.

It should be borne in mind that this is not the usual exposition appropriation for a temporary building which will be torn down, but has for its purpose a building of a permanent character, under the control and direction of the Secretary of War, that will be used for military purposes.

The Government of the United States should lead the way for the other nations of the earth, and it would have been a great stimulus to this exposition if this course had been followed. Our action up to date has proven more harmful than helpful to the success of the exposition. It has resulted in other nations being slow to take part, and in at least one instance has resulted in one of the nations refusing to participate at all.

These discussions on the floor of the House are not helpful, and instead of boosting this great exposition will do a great deal of harm. I trust that at this late day the House of Representatives will make up for whatever negligence we might have shown in the past by adopting the motion of my colleague [Mr. KAHN] to concur in the Senate amendment and provide for this permanent building, which shall be used during the exposition period to house the Government exhibit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ].

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this appropriation, but I take occasion now to call the attention of the House to the fact that in addition to a glorious climate and a few native sons, California produces the best bunch of liars that I ever knew. I say this, of course, in an impersonal sense. I happened to be a Member of the House in 1911, when the contest waged between my city of New Orleans and San Francisco took place, and I recall with distinctness the iteration and reiteration of the fact that California and San Francisco were quite self-sufficient, that they needed no Government aid and they wanted no Government aid, and that neither at that time nor at any future time would they ask for Government aid. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that up to the present time \$800,000 have been appropriated by the Federal Government to assist in this fair, and now \$500,000 more are asked, making, in all, \$1,300,000. When we from Louisiana came here with a naked, plain, straight-out proposition, saying that we wanted \$1,000,000, we were told by gentlemen who voted for San Francisco that they were voting for San Francisco because no Government appropriation would be asked for or accepted, and yet these gentlemen from California are here exceeding our request made three years ago by \$300,000.

I can well believe, Mr. Speaker, that the two great universities on the Pacific slope—Berkeley and Palo Alto—have created a chair for the special purpose of promoting the gentle art of mendacity.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana yields back two minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions at the time San Francisco was selected as the place to hold the exposition to commemorate the opening of the Panama Canal. It is true that the representatives of San Francisco made a proposal to Congress and to that committee which did not contemplate that there should be a Government exhibit or a building. That was not a part of their proposition. Their proposition was simply that when the President should be satisfied that a corporation under the laws of the State of California had been organized and had \$15,000,000 at its disposal for the purpose of inaugurating and carrying on an exposition for this purpose, then an invitation to all of the nations and peoples of the world should be extended to come and participate in the exposition.

The proposition of New Orleans was that the United States Government should inaugurate the exposition and should contribute \$1,000,000 as provided in that bill. I should have voted for San Francisco even if their bill had carried a provision for a Government exhibit. I want to correct the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ]. I do not think it is fair to say that the representatives from San Francisco and California have been guilty of mendacity in this matter. If you examine the hearings before the committee at the time these representations were made, you will observe that they said they did not ask and would not ask that the Government of the United States should either have a Government exhibit there or a Government building for that exhibit. They did not say, and it was brought out in the discussion that they would oppose the Government having an exhibit or a building, and, in fact, some one, I think, made the remark during those hearings that the Government of the United States could not very well honorably abstain from having an exhibit at an exposition to participate in which they invited all of the other nations of the world. That was in 1911. We passed the resolution that San Francisco proposed, and afterwards, two years later, the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions brought in a bill to provide for an expensive commission, as the gentleman from New York has said, and for a \$2,000,000 appropriation, to aid in carrying on the exposition. I opposed that most strenuously, because I thought it was a violation of the spirit of the proposal made by San Francisco, and it was not necessary. However, there was nothing in what San Francisco did or said or promised which prevented the United States Government from having an exhibit there if they wanted to. This is an industrial exposition.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the gentleman not recall that in his previous speech he quoted Mr. Scott, the head of the exposition company, as saying that he would not take the exhibit?

Mr. STEENERSON. I know what I said.

Mr. SHERLEY. He would not take it if they gave it to him.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, they could not prevent the Government of the United States from exhibiting at an exposition. We must remember that the United States Government, in addition to its regular Government work, is one of the greatest industrial institutions in the world, carrying on forestry and irrigation; we are making cannon and ammunition and carrying on factories in almost every line of industry, and this being an exposition of an industrial character, it is appropriate that the United States should take part in it and have an exhibit. Two years after the proposal of San Francisco was made, the United States Congress, whether with or without the request of San Francisco, or California, appropriated for a Government exhibit. Congress had the right to provide for a Government exhibit, and did so in the sundry civil bill a year ago. I do not think much weight should be given to the argument that San Francisco promised not to ask for a Government exhibit. That fact should not and did not prevent us from having one, if we saw fit to do so. Manifestly, Congress thought that it would not be proper to be unrepresented at an exposition to which it invited other nations and which was to commemorate one of the greatest events in history, a triumph of peace and industry and not of war. Over a year ago provision for a suitable Government exhibit was made.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?
Mr. STEENERSON. No; I decline to yield now.

The question now comes up on the conference report on the sundry civil appropriation bill, which contains an item appropriating \$500,000 for the construction of buildings at the Presidio in San Francisco which can be used temporarily for the housing of the Government exhibit and afterwards permanently as barracks and buildings suitable for that military post.

I am advised that the Secretary of War strongly favors the proposition, that the present buildings used for the troops are in poor condition and would have to be discarded within a year or two, anyway, and that by a comparatively very slight expense the buildings proposed to be built could be made to suit the purposes of the War Department after the exposition is ended.

Although, as I have stated, I opposed the \$2,000,000 appropriation, I shall vote in favor of the present item. As the event we are to celebrate—the completion of the Panama Canal—draws near, it is natural that we should all feel a just pride in the great achievement. It is an event that swells the heart of every patriotic citizen. It is an event that fills with enthusiasm every friend of civilization throughout the whole world. The interest of the people of the world is constantly growing. I am advised that applications for space at the Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco are so numerous that it will be impossible to fill them, only in part. When we made the appropriation a year ago for the Government exhibit we provided that suitable buildings for the housing of all said exhibits shall be provided by the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co. without expense of any kind to the Government of the United States, and that company, I am informed, is ready and willing to provide the buildings, but that if the Government would provide these buildings in the manner indicated it would give them much more space for other exhibits and would aid greatly in making the exposition even a greater success than it otherwise would be. I think, therefore, that as reasonable men we ought to take into consideration and account the changed situation, the changed circumstances. In view of these circumstances it seems to me we ought to favor this item and appropriate this additional \$500,000 for the erection of these buildings, which may be used by the exposition for the Government exhibit and afterwards as permanent structures for the War Department. I believe thoroughly in holding people to their word, especially in the matter of expositions, for our experiences in the past have not always been satisfactory; but I do not think it fair to accuse the people of San Francisco of bad faith. The Chief Executive recommended Government participation. This proposition for a building comes favorably recommended by the State Department. The committee, through a sense of fitness of things, brings forward this measure of their own accord, and it seems to me under all the circumstances that we can well afford to support the modest appropriation for these buildings which will in the course of time be of permanent use to the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are beginning to regard the Congress somewhat in the light of gypsy horse traders, and twice in my experience here I have myself been cheated. A number of years ago we increased the salary of the President of the United States to \$75,000 a year on the positive assurance of the gentlemen who were back of the proposition that that would cover mileage, salary, and all, as was then being expended as salary and mileage. In the next Congress the same gentlemen who insisted the presidential salary bill meant a total of \$75,000 brought in another bill providing for \$25,000 for mileage for the President. I voted for the \$75,000 proposition and got flimmed. Some years later the gentlemen from California proposed that the Panama exposition be sent to San Francisco, and with much eloquence and with forceful assurance, to me at least, they captured the exposition for San Francisco largely on the theory that San Francisco was going to pay all the expense. I voted for San Francisco under those conditions, and now in another Congress we are told that we are not responsible for what promises were made in other Congresses, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the United States most certainly remember those promises, and we certainly ought to keep faith with the same. I believe the proposition ought to be voted down.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have never been overenthusiastic in the matter of international expositions, and I will

suffer no particular sorrow when the custom of holding these expositions passes. But I remember that I was moved once before sentimentally in this body on account of San Francisco, and I am willing to be moved in that splendid city's behalf in the same way to-day. It is a little less than 10 years ago that San Francisco was stricken by an earthquake—

Mr. KAHN. Less than eight years ago.

Mr. MURDOCK. Less than eight years ago—a disaster which appealed to the sympathy of the Nation and met immediate response in Congress. San Francisco has done a wonderful thing since, a thing which is not paralleled in the history of the world, in building itself up, a greater, finer, better city than before. The exposition is to be a crowning achievement. The men who came here at the time of the contest between the two cities which sought the exposition and made promises that they would not ask for governmental aid did a foolish thing. So far as I am concerned they did not deceive me. Despite their promises I knew the request for aid would come, and I am willing to vote to-day for the Government to build a structure there worthy of the Government, and for this further reason—I have read in the last six or eight months repeatedly in the cable dispatches instances where foreign Governments asked to make exhibits are hanging back. The Panama Exposition at San Francisco consequently has had, within the knowledge of everyone here, a hard row to hoe. Now, we can not expect other Governments to appropriate money to take part in that exposition if we as a Government hang back ourselves. Certainly the event of opening the canal is one worthy of a fitting celebration, and this Government ought not to stint the exposition so far as it is concerned. This appropriation, in my opinion, ought to be made regardless of promises which have been made by the officials of that exposition in the past.

Mr. FALCONER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I will.

Mr. FALCONER. Does the gentleman figure that a provision for a permanent building that the Government needs there is in any way in conflict with the promises made by the delegation from California several years ago?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, I should say yes, but regardless of the promises, this Government ought to erect a suitable building at San Francisco. Now, I have quite a record in Congress on expositions. I voted under protest for the \$4,600,000 as a loan to St. Louis, and my protest was based on the fear that St. Louis would never pay the money back. St. Louis did pay the money back and if I had to vote on the proposition over again I should again cast my vote for St. Louis, and that without hesitation. We ought not to be too hard on our terms in a matter in which the whole Nation is concerned before the world. I believe this appropriation should be passed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, this progressiveness is shocking. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, my vote in favor of San Francisco as against New Orleans was secured by the promise of the representatives from California that they never would ask or accept a dollar from the United States, a promise not made vaguely, but made definitely, precisely, and it has been quoted here by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. FITZGERALD]. Now, to have such a proposition as this come before the House makes me feel as if I had been defrauded and my vote had been secured by false pretenses and I certainly can not participate in that fraud. I am not disposed to criticize or feel harshly toward the Representatives from California here. I appreciate their delicate position. I appreciate that they must consider public sentiment at home and, therefore, as I say, I feel leniently toward them. I feel they are in a different position from the rest of us, that they have to represent their people, and are advocates and not judges, but I think all the rest of this House, everybody who sits in a judicial capacity and who votes as he thinks is right, stultifies himself if he votes for a proposition like this.

They said they would not ask for a dollar. They have already had \$800,000, and now they are asking for \$500,000 more. And the argument of my friend from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], it seems to me, was so specious that I do not see how he could even deceive himself. The United States, of course, can offer this appropriation, but we all know the initiative and pressure brought upon the House for every one of these appropriations was from California, and it was not any voluntary offer of the United States to do it. And therefore, after the promises so specifically made, it seems to me that it is shameful and shameless for California now to ask this contribution.

The proposition that the building is for a barracks is obviously a mere subterfuge and evasion. A building costing

\$500,000 for exposition purposes will either be not good enough for the exposition or it will be too good for a barracks. If the United States wants permanent barracks, let us build them; but let us not deceive ourselves or be deceived by the pretense that this is not a plain proposition to do what we were told we never would be asked to do, and a repudiation of the pledge which caused many of us originally to vote in favor of San Francisco.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has used four minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when this matter was originally before the House I voted for New Orleans. There is no question here, it seems to me, involving the gentlemen from California. This is not a request upon their part, nor does it come from the city of San Francisco or the State of California. In 1911, Mr. Speaker, we passed a resolution authorizing the President of the United States to invite foreign nations to participate in that exposition. We thereby committed ourselves to this project, say what we please about it. These foreign nations are to take part; they are constructing their buildings, and it would be a reflection on the honor of this Government if we did not make some sort of exposition of our Government affairs and resources at that place.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] says it is a mere subterfuge. I can not believe that the Secretary of War would make himself a party to a subterfuge. He has gone before the committee and has stated that in the course of a very short time, at best, we will be forced to erect barracks on the Presidio; that the present buildings are nothing more than soup houses; that a building can be erected for this purpose; and that the only loss to the Government would be the use of the building during this exposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State and the President of the United States have asked Congress to make a fit appropriation commensurate with the dignity of this Government and the great event to be celebrated at that exposition. It is not any sharp practice, it is not a question of deceit, and I am amazed that gentlemen stand upon this floor and attack Representatives from the State of California who do not ask it for themselves or for their people, but it comes as a request of the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of War, and we ought to grant it in order to preserve our honor among the nations of the earth. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this appropriation. If I am able to determine the nature of a contract, the State of California, two or three years ago, when they were seeking to get this exposition, made a solemn contract with the Government of the United States, and that contract was that if you would give the exposition to the city of San Francisco the time would never come when they would ask the Government of the United States for one dollar. You can not twist the English language to mean anything else. That was the bold, bald, emphatic statement made by what I supposed then and suppose now to be the accredited spokesmen for the State of California, and the entire West, where they wanted this exposition held. On the strength of that statement, in my mind and my judgment there is not a shadow of doubt but that the resolution was carried. You can call this thing what you will, but it is an adjunct of the exposition. That is all it is and that is all it is intended for. And after having come upon the floor of the House, in a strenuous fight led by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], to hold this exposition at San Francisco, with Mr. Rodenberg, of Illinois, leading the fight for New Orleans, finally sufficient votes were secured upon these promises to hold that exposition at San Francisco. Now, does this later request come with very good grace? I do not criticize anybody, but I put it squarely to the gentleman from California if it comes with very good grace to appear before the Congress of the United States, after having made the statement that you never would take a dollar, and after receiving \$800,000, that you first said you would never ask for, and request this appropriation of \$500,000 more? I do not believe it does; and I do not think this amendment ought to carry. It ought to be overwhelmingly defeated in order to teach people to stand up to their contracts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, it seems to me the question of what was said in the debate when the original resolution was passed ought not to be considered now. I think everybody recognizes and realizes that at present that resolu-

tion, so far as the vote was concerned, stands where it was thought it was going to be before all the pulling of eagle feathers occurred on the floor of the House. There is not the slightest doubt in the world that any statement made by any Member of the delegation from California did not have relation or refer to the Government itself participating in this exposition. Here is the question of a building to be erected for the War Department on Government land to be used only for a few months by the exposition for the purpose, not of the exposition, not for California, not for San Francisco, but for the United States Government, that it may exemplify the kind and character of this Government. Our history—

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. In just a moment. It is to be erected so that it may exemplify the principles on which this Government was founded, the Declaration of Independence, and all those things that relate to it; that they might be placed there in this exposition, and, in addition to that, exhibits showing our material advancement, so that civilized peoples of the world may come to the Government building and see what has been done by the United States.

The Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions had under consideration a similar bill to the provisions now under consideration in this bill.

The bill was prepared in conference with Secretary Bryan, of the State Department, and Secretary Garrison, of the War Department, and meets with their approval, and the same was sent to the committee by the two Secretaries. The Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions reported favorably on the bill H. R. 16327, which is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16327) to provide an appropriation for the erection of a building within which to install a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition.

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to enable the said Government Exhibit Board created by the sundry civil appropriation act approved June 23, 1913, properly to install, display, and safeguard the exhibit of the Government of the United States at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to erect, by contract or otherwise, a suitable building in that part of the reservation of the United States known as the Presidio, at a cost not to exceed \$500,000, in which to install, display, and safeguard the said exhibits of the Government of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the said building shall be so planned and of such permanent character as will make it available and useful for military purposes of the United States after the close of the said exposition, and shall be on such general plan and design as shall be approved by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of War.

The provisions of the present bill are as follows:

PANAMA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION.

Building to install the Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition: For the construction of a suitable building in that part of the reservation of the United States known as the Presidio of San Francisco, State of California, in which the Government Exhibit Board, created by the sundry civil appropriation act approved June 23, 1913, shall install, display, and safeguard the exhibit of the Government of the United States at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, \$500,000: *Provided,* That the said building shall be so located and planned and shall be of such a permanent character as will make it available and useful for military purposes of the United States after the close of the said exposition, and shall be on such general plan and design and in such location as shall be approved by the Secretary of War: *Provided further,* That the said building shall be erected under the authority of the Secretary of War, by contract or otherwise, as he may direct: *Provided further,* That not exceeding \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended from the appropriation made herein, on the approval and authority of the Secretary of War, for entertaining the officers and representatives of foreign Governments who may attend and participate in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in consequence of the invitation of the President of the United States, extended in pursuance of the authority of Congress.

The provisions contained in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914," which provides for the participation of the United States in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, be amended as follows: Under the head of "To provide for the participation of the United States in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition," the paragraph on page 81, which reads as follows: "The President of the United States is authorized to detail three civilian officers or employees from the executive departments as members of a commission which is hereby constituted as the National Exposition Commission, one of said commissioners, who shall be the chairman of said commission, shall be detailed from the Department of State. Vacancies in said commission shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments. Each commissioner shall receive in addition to his original compensation his actual necessary traveling expenses and an allowance of \$10 per day in lieu of subsistence. Said commissioners may appoint a secretary at \$2,500 per annum, and the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended for clerical, office, and other necessary and actual expenses of said commission," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The President of the United States is authorized to detail two civilian officers or employees from the executive departments, also one to be appointed from civil life, as members of the commission which is hereby constituted as the national exposition commission; one of said commissioners, who shall be the chairman of said commission, shall be detailed from the Department of State, the commissioner appointed from civil life to receive a salary at the rate of \$5,000 per annum until the exposition closes. Vacancies in said commission shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments. Each commissioner detailed as aforesaid shall receive, in addition to his original compensation, necessary traveling expenses and an allowance of \$10 per day in lieu

of subsistence while on duty in San Francisco. Said commissioners may appoint a secretary at \$2,500 per annum, and the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended for clerk hire and actual expenses of said commission."

The objects and purposes of the bill reported by the House Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions has for its object the same purpose as this amendment. This amendment is more extensive and in detail, and gives some additional legislation. A year ago an appropriation of \$500,000 for the preparation of a Government exhibit at this exposition was made, and ever since that time the work of preparing such an exhibit has been going on under the auspices of the officials designated by the President. That the United States should make a suitable exhibit is self-evident. This country has extended an invitation to foreign powers to participate in this world exposition, and being the host of all foreign countries and all foreigners who bring to this land their wares, arts, and methods of education, and of all who may attend the exposition, therefore it is certainly incumbent upon the United States to do its part.

On April 2, 1914, President Wilson sent a message to the Congress, transmitting the statement of the Secretary of State recommending an appropriation for the erection of a building on the Presidio grounds in which to install the Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. The message of the President and the statement of Mr. Bryan, the Secretary of State, are as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending an appropriation of \$500,000 for the erection of a building within which to install, display, and safeguard at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition at San Francisco the Government exhibit authorized by the sundry civil appropriation act of June 23, 1913.

As pointed out by the Secretary of State, many of the Governments, officially invited guests by the United States to participate in the exposition, are erecting buildings within which to house their exhibits at the exposition. The Government of the United States should not be behind these in appropriately providing for its national exhibit.

I commend the recommendation to the favorable consideration of Congress.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 31, 1914.

THE PRESIDENT:

The sundry civil appropriation act approved June 23, 1913, appropriates \$500,000 for the purpose of inaugurating, installing, maintaining, and returning a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition to open at San Francisco next year, of such articles and materials as illustrate the functions and administrative faculty of the Government of the United States tending to demonstrate the nature and growth of our institutions, their adaptation to the wants of the people, and the progress of the Nation in the arts of peace and war; and authorized the President to provide for the collection and exhibition of such articles and materials under the direction of a board which is created by the act, to which is imposed the duty of determining the nature and character and extent of the exhibits to be made and which is charged with the collection, purchase, preparation, safe-keeping, and exhibition and return of such articles and materials as the board may decide shall be exhibited. But no provision is made by that act or by any previous or subsequent act for the erection of a suitable building within which these exhibits may be installed, displayed, and safeguarded.

The policy of the Federal Government to support the exposition was fixed by the joint resolution of February 15, 1911, which requested the President of the United States to invite all the nations of the earth to participate therein, and the invitation extended in pursuance thereof by the President to all the nations of the earth to take part in the exposition gives to the exposition in the minds of the foreign Governments an official character.

Twenty-seven of these Governments have responded favorably to the invitation, most of which have buildings in course of construction in which to house their exhibits, while many of our States have signified their intention to take a worthy part in the exposition, and have made provision for the erection of State buildings. Of the Governments which have not yet accepted the invitation, few have actually declined, while others are awaiting the assembling of their legislative bodies for appropriate action.

I deem it important that the Government of the United States should make at the exposition such a display as will be commensurate with the international scope and importance of the exposition and as will comport with the dignity and standing of the United States. This can not be done, and the exhibit would be of little value if scattered through the exposition buildings, space in which I understand is already insufficient for individual exhibitors. To be imposing it should be collected together under one roof. The site set apart for the building is on the Government reservation in the Presidio. A building there erected by the Government could no doubt be utilized after the exposition for Army uses and it should be constructed with that end in view.

The sum of \$500,000 is not too large for this purpose, and I recommend that Congress be requested to appropriate that amount for the erection of the building.

Respectfully submitted,

W. J. BRYAN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 30, 1914.

A building of the character contemplated by this amendment ought to be erected at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. Twenty-seven foreign Governments have accepted the invitation of the President to participate in this exposition. Each of these Governments will construct a building for the housing of its exhibits. The Government of the United States being

the host at this exposition, it is eminently proper that the United States should also have a building wherein its exhibits can be displayed to the best possible advantage. Unless a building such as is contemplated by this amendment is constructed the exhibits of the United States Government will be scattered through many buildings, and the very object and purpose of assembling the Government exhibit so that it may be an object lesson to our visitors from abroad, as well as to the citizens from all over the United States, will not be attained.

At the exhibitions that have been held heretofore the Government display has invariably been one of the chief attractions. The exhibit contemplated by the commission authorized by the sundry civil appropriation act of June 23, 1913, will be the most comprehensive and instructive that has ever been displayed by the United States at any exposition. The Government exhibit should not be scattered through a half dozen buildings. It would be very unfortunate if they had to be thus scattered. The people of the United States should be able to see and view the many attractions in which the Government is engaged, and those attractions and works should be exhibited at one place and under one building and in the most comprehensive and instructive manner. They can be arrayed to a much better advantage when grouped together in one building. Otherwise many of them will be lost sight of by a large number of the visitors, and one of the chief objects and purposes of the Government exhibit will be destroyed.

Nearly all of the States of the Union have accepted an invitation to participate, and will construct their own buildings to house their exhibits and provide places of assembly for the people of the various States. This will be in addition to the exhibits of foreign Governments.

The building contemplated by this amendment will be of a permanent character and will be so constructed that it can be used by the War Department when the exposition is over. It will be placed on the Government property on what is known as the Presidio. The Secretary of War, in speaking of the construction of this building when he appeared before the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions of the House pointed out that he believed a proper building for exposition purposes could be so constructed that after the close of the exposition it would be easily and inexpensively converted into a barracks. His statement before the committee of the House, in part, is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when I was out at San Francisco on an inspection tour this summer, I found that while some of our buildings at the Presidio were in good condition and were suitable for the purpose for which they were being used, there was a great number of buildings there, which we had to use under the circumstances, which were entirely unfit. Many of them had been temporarily erected at the time of the Philippine troubles, when we were having great numbers of troops, and since that time they have been patched up and kept in use, but they are really not such buildings as should be used for housing troops or for other governmental purposes.

They endeavored to enlist me—and very properly—in an attempt to have the Presidio present an appearance to the visitors who would come to the exposition which would be a credit to the military branch of the Government, and, of course, to the Government itself. I told them that I did not feel justified in asking for a direct appropriation in the Army bill, except for enough money to put into such shape as we could the existing buildings and to fix up the offices and other things that would necessarily have to be used. I therefore asked for no extra appropriation for this purpose in the Army bill and none was granted. Out of what was granted, such an allotment was made, under due administrative procedure, as was thought proper by the Quartermaster General, and that will be placed at the disposal of the commander of that department and will be utilized to paint these old buildings and repair them where they have gone into disrepair, and generally make the Presidio as presentable as possible.

The question was then taken up about the necessity, from the standpoint of those who had the interests of the Government at heart, of a building specifically to house the Government exhibits. I told them I had no concern with that, except as an intellectual concern—none as an official—and if they could get the department of the Government that was concerned to recommend it, I would take such interest in it as was proper. They said if they could get the Department of State and the President interested and show them the desirability of the United States Government doing that which, I think, 26 or 27 other Governments were doing, namely, have a building of their own, they would arrange to put this building on the Presidio and erect it under our supervision and make it so that we could convert it into some useful Army purpose. If they can be so built as to be changed into barracks, it would be of immense advantage to the Government, and really would be no loss whatever. Its use during the period of the exposition would be the only loss to the War Department.

It is absolutely necessary sometime to erect barracks there for one regiment, because they are now living in most curious buildings. They look like soup kitchens temporarily turned into living apartments. They are long, low frame buildings, built of cheap lumber, and I think it is only the splendid climate that enable them to stand as long as they have. I do not think in our climate here they would have stood so long. They are technically called cantonments, because they are all in long rows.

Mr. HAMLIN. You spoke of "them" making certain recommendations. To whom do you refer?

Secretary GARRISON. I refer to the officials of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition—the president, Mr. Moore, and I do not recall the name of the other gentleman—who particularly enlisted my attention.

Mr. HAMLIN. The reason I ask that question is that the statement was made that San Francisco was not asking this.

Secretary GARRISON. At the time I was there, as I now recall it, the mayor of San Francisco was absent.

Mr. HAMLIN. The parties in charge of the exposition spoke to you?

Secretary GARRISON. Yes; they came to me.

Mr. KAHN. I have not spoken to you about this matter.

Secretary GARRISON. No, sir; not in any way. Now, to continue what I was going to say: If this building can be so constructed that by the expenditure of a very inconsiderable amount of money—and perhaps it could be saved out of the initial appropriation—it could be turned into a barracks, then there is no question but that it is an economical and wise and proper thing for the Government to do, providing it wishes to initially have that sort of a building there for exhibition purposes. Of course, if you give me \$500,000 to build a barracks, I will do it immediately, because it is needed. If you do it in this indirect way, it would be just as beneficial to the Army.

I would send for the Quartermaster and the Chief of Engineers, and I would say, "Gentlemen, you have \$500,000. Can you construct a building for exhibition purposes to be used during the exposition, and, with no structural change—only interior changes—convert it into a barracks afterwards?" And I would take their judgment in the matter.

Mr. FRANCIS. If it is not completed in the way contemplated, is it your opinion that an appropriation would have to be asked for it soon from the War Department?

Secretary GARRISON. Oh, yes. You can not go on with the Presidio for many more years without erecting a barracks for Infantry. You must have them there for the Pacific coast. I just ordered a brigade there that was on the border. Their present cantonments are very inadequate for the purpose.

The present plan is to erect, as nearly as possible, one building for our barracks, following out the idea of the continental countries, where they get a whole regiment where we have our officers' quarters. It is perfectly amazing, for we have 8 and 10 miles covering some of our military posts. They have to be kept up. Sewer pipes have to be put down and gas pipes and all that sort of thing, and the present conception of that is to keep these things—if we can build a barracks and house a regiment—on a half acre of ground, instead of spreading it over an acre and a half of ground. It is not a matter of ground that makes the difference, but it is these accessories, and of course those are expensive things. The upkeep is an expensive thing. It is not the initial investment but the constant upkeep.

I am rather inclined to think, with this modern conception, the Quartermaster General and the Chief of Engineers could suggest a building with that money which could afterwards be converted into a barracks for practically a whole regiment—probably for eight companies, and then spend a small amount of money for the other four companies. My own opinion is, if this was spent under our direction, the Army would get a very practical benefit from it, because when they got the exhibits out it would be a mere matter of removing the partitions. In all these modern barracks the rooms are low and there are places in the center for the gun racks. The partitions could be removed or additional partitions could be put up if the room was too large.

We are trying to concentrate everything, and instead of having a lot of these little cantonments we are trying to put up one substantial building, mostly of some kind of concrete, and housing just as many men as we can under the one roof, because that saves in utility and upkeep.

It is conceded on all hands that it is absolutely necessary to erect a barracks on the Presidio at San Francisco for one regiment. The present buildings are old, inadequate, wooden structures, built of cheap lumber, and if it were not for the splendid climate of California they would probably not have been able to stand as long as they have. It is further conceded that it will be impossible to go on many years more as they have without erecting a barracks for the Infantry at the Presidio.

The construction of the building contemplated by this amendment will be in line with the policy of building by the War Department in recent years, to put up one substantial structure and house just as many men as can be housed under the one roof, because that saves in utility and upkeep.

The fact that the buildings that are used at present for the barracks by the enlisted men at the Presidio are entirely inadequate for the purposes for which they are being used—and the construction of the building authorized by this amendment will meet a useful and permanent purpose—there should be no question or doubt on the part of any Member of the House in voting for this amendment.

This legislation is recommended by the President of the United States, by the Secretary of State, and by the War Department, and surely after such investigation by the administration and those in charge of this kind of work and the needs and necessities of such a building the House should unanimously recede from its disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment.

This is to be a Government work, necessary and permanent. It will enable the proper display of the Government's exhibit and attractions, and then after a few months' use can and will be readily converted into quarters for the Army stationed at the Presidio.

From every consideration and from every viewpoint it is a question of economy in the long run; and that being the case, every Member should feel that he is doing the right thing when he casts his vote for the amendment.

I sincerely trust that the Senate amendment will be agreed to, to the end that ample provision may be made for construction of this building at this time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, it is true that the people of California believed they would not require a Government exhibit. It is true they believed they would not require a dollar from the Federal Treasury. But some months after Congress decided that San Francisco should be the place where the exposition to commemorate the completion of the Panama Canal should be held 17 of the powers of Europe sent commissioners who met in the city of Berlin and agreed upon an exposition treaty. The terms of that treaty were such that unless a Government exhibit were made by us practically all of Europe would be absent from this exposition at San Francisco. Those facts came to the knowledge of the exposition company and created consternation. And because those facts stared the Government of the United States in the face the President sent a message asking for a Government exhibit.

That is how the matter came before this House. Then Congress voted for a Government exhibit. It was to be spread through all the buildings of the exposition.

Personally I had no objection to that; but the Secretary of War believes, and the men who are on the exposition board believe, that it would be better to have all of the exhibits of the Government under one roof. I spoke with one of them this morning, and he told me that it would be much better to have the exhibits under one roof in a Government building.

Practically every civilized country in the world will have a building at the exposition at San Francisco. England and Germany are the two notable exceptions. On the floor of the House of Commons, when Sir Edward Grey was asked why England was not going to participate, he said that this Government had done nothing for the exposition at San Francisco, and for that reason he did not see any reason why England should be called upon to be represented there. That is what we have had to face.

Mr. DUPRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I can not yield just now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. KAHN. I would like to yield to my friend, but I have only 14 minutes. If I can get more time, I will gladly yield.

Japan is putting up a building with an exhibit at a cost of \$600,000. France is putting up a building with exhibits to cost \$400,000. China will put in a building and an exhibit at a cost of half a million dollars. The commissioners of the Argentine Republic are in this city to-day, and they announce that the Argentine Republic is spending \$1,150,000 for a building and an exhibit. Italy, Spain, Portugal, Holland, Sweden, and even little Switzerland will have beautiful Government pavilions. All of Central and South America will have buildings; and nearly every State in the Union will have its own State building.

Now, this proposed Government building is to be a permanent building for the Army, and the Secretary of War authorized me to say upon this floor and upon his responsibility that the building is needed, and that such a building can be constructed.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I regret that I can not yield. Their purpose, as I understand it, is to put up the frame at this time and later on complete the interior of the building. The Presidio of San Francisco is a three-regiment infantry post. At the present time there are decent barracks there for one and one-half regiments. The other barracks are mere whitewashed shacks, put up during the Spanish-American War; they were not even constructed by skilled mechanics. They were put up by the soldiers themselves. They are whitewashed temporary quarters, a disgrace to the Government of the United States. The Secretary of War stated before the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions that in any other climate they would have had to be abandoned long ago. These buildings that it is proposed to pull down are in the exposition grounds. I have pictures—photographs—of them. They are, as I said a moment ago, a disgrace to the Government of the United States.

Now, let me tell you some of the things that the exposition company has done for the Government in the Presidio. For years estimates have been sent to Congress by the War Department asking that a certain marsh on the northern end of the Presidio be filled in. The estimates, as I now recall, were for \$300,000. That work has been done by the exposition company. They have given to this Government \$300,000 worth of work that the Government needed in that one spot alone. They have laid out a magnificent parade ground for the Government of the United States. The exposition company paid for it. It does not cost the Government a dollar. They have laid out magnificent parks and roads and parterres, where shrubbery has been planted; they have set out beautiful trees on the Presidio

grounds. They have beautified the Presidio of San Francisco in a way that this Government never would have done, probably, or would not have done for years. The work that the exposition company has done is probably worth \$400,000 to the Government of the United States.

Now, if this proposed building were simply to be torn down when the exposition is over, if it were not to be a permanent building, perhaps there would be good reason why it should not be constructed. But it is to be a permanent building. It is to house the soldiers of the United States; and any gentleman who has ever been in the Presidio of San Francisco and has looked upon the whitewashed shacks in which the soldiers now live will realize how important it is to put up decent barracks and quarters for the soldiers who wear the blue.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I wanted to ask the gentleman this question: If conditions such as he describes have existed, why has not the Secretary of War or the War Department appealed to Congress for relief?

Mr. KAHN. The Secretary of War has done that repeatedly, and the Committee on Appropriations has always turned down the items in the estimates. I can show the gentleman the estimates. They have not been sent down in the last few years, because they got tired of sending them down.

Mr. DUPRÉ. When was the last time?

Mr. KAHN. I do not recall; but I know that the grounds at that time were needed for field artillery maneuvers; but the Congress never provided the funds for filling in the swamp, and it has all been filled in since by the exposition company.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. BARNHART. Is it not a matter of fact that the project of constructing this building on the Presidio has been before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for a long time?

Mr. KAHN. It has never been before that committee to my knowledge.

Mr. BARNHART. It has been to my knowledge.

Mr. KAHN. I repeat, it has never been before that committee, and I can not yield any further. It has never been before that committee at any time. It has been before the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, because the communications from the President of the United States and the Secretary of State recommending this appropriation were referred to that committee; but the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has never had any jurisdiction whatever of this matter. The gentleman probably has in mind the marine hospital, which is several miles away from the exposition grounds and which has nothing whatever to do with the exposition.

Now, reference has been made to the \$100,000 in the naval appropriation bill and to the \$200,000 for the customhouse. The \$200,000 will come back into the Treasury of the United States, every dollar of it, through the customs revenues that will be collected at the exposition at San Francisco. The \$100,000 for the Navy will not be expended at San Francisco. The great bulk of it will be expended right here and at Hampton Roads. That is where the fleets will come together. That is where the great entertainment is to be. The naval officers of the world's fleet are to call here upon the President of the United States. They are to be entertained here in Washington long before they reach San Francisco, and at Hampton Roads, and the bulk of the money will be expended here and at Hampton Roads; so that those expenses should not be charged up against the exposition. The fleets will go to San Francisco as a finality, but the ships of war are first going to assemble in Hampton Roads, and the money was intended to do the entertaining there. I believe that but a small part of it is to be expended at San Francisco. All that the Congress has appropriated for the exposition is \$500,000 for a Government exhibit.

I have told you under what circumstances that money came to be appropriated. I am now explaining to you why the other \$500,000 is asked for. That has not been asked by the exposition company, so far as I know. It has been asked by the executive officers of this Government. The President of the United States and the Secretary of State recommended it. The Secretary of War himself appeared before one of the committees of this House and pointed out the necessity for it. The Secretary of Commerce on a recent visit to San Francisco realized the necessity for it, and upon his own motion wrote me a strong letter in which he said it was absolutely essential, or

words to that effect, that this building be put up for the honor of the people of the United States.

As far as the directors of the exposition company are concerned, they, as the hosts of the Nation, are going to put up the most magnificent exposition that the world has ever seen. Every American citizen will take pride in it. Every Member of Congress will be proud of what the people of California have done for this Government in planning and executing this superb exposition. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] stated how the people of San Francisco were stricken eight years ago. Their undaunted courage in rehabilitating their city has gained for them the admiration of mankind. But, sir, only two years ago a killing frost in one night destroyed practically the entire citrus fruit crop of the State of California, valued at approximately \$30,000,000. It was a terrific blow to our citizens. Yet the people of that State have gone into their pockets and have put up over \$30,000,000, or will have put it up by the time the exposition doors open, for this undertaking to which the nations of the world have been invited by the President of the United States. No other exposition ever came to Congress for so little as this. St. Louis, in the region in which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] lives, got \$11,600,000. Of this sum \$4,000,000 was paid back, but the balance was practically an outright gift in aid of the exposition. The city of Chicago got nearly \$6,000,000 as an outright gift in aid of the exposition. Yet we have not asked for a dollar and do not intend to ask for a dollar in aid of the exposition itself. What has been asked for has been asked simply because conditions compelled it. If we could have looked into the future, if we could have foreseen the attitude of European nations, we probably never would have made the statements we did. But we made them. We made a mistake, because we could not foresee the future. We did it honestly, we did it sincerely; we are but human, and it is only human to err. But as American citizens you are interested in the success and the excellence of this exposition just as much as we are. I certainly hope that Congress in its wisdom will vote for this building, which is so earnestly needed. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] concludes his eloquent remarks with the statement that San Francisco will never ask anything for aid of the exposition itself. A few years ago that statement would have convinced me that the future would warrant the statement, but unfortunately I recall that the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] was even more emphatic and equally eloquent in his promise that they would never ask a cent even for a Government exhibit or any building for that Government exhibit. Why, the gentleman's enthusiasm carried him so far that he said a Government exhibit did not amount to much, anyway.

Mr. KAHN. I thought so.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will put into the Record the language of the gentleman.

Mr. KAHN. I said that.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman said that we had gone so far with Government exhibits that there was nothing new in them, that they would go into every State in the Union and get State exhibits; that they were raising their own money and did not want any of Uncle Sam's money. The trouble then was that they were faced with a contest that they thought they were going to lose, and which they would have lost if they had not gotten a new hold and have come here with that promise. It was not definite enough originally to suit them, and they had a subsequent hearing, and then they made it ironclad. Now, I believe in men keeping their word. I believe in communities keeping their word. I believe in States keeping their word; and if we are ever to stop the abuse of obtaining money from the Government under false pretenses we have got to do it now. [Applause.]

If I let my personal feelings for individual members of the California delegation control me here, then I might vote in the affirmative and have the pleasing reflection that I had done something that was pleasing to them.

I say to you now that the very recital of the instances of St. Louis and Chicago shows that we have got to stop now if we are ever to get done with this proposition of helping along every community that wants to have an exposition. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] undertakes to say that because St. Louis got it—in his kindness he adds "St. Louis, near the gentleman's district"—therefore California ought to receive Government aid, and the statement is made here that if this building is not given the Government is going to be disgraced. Why, in point of fact, the exhibit at the San Francisco exposition by the Federal Government will be the best that has ever been made by the Federal Government. I make that statement on the authority of the men who are preparing this ex-

hibit and because this time they were chosen from departments that knew something about the business, and were not chosen simply in order that they might draw a salary and enjoy themselves at the exposition. You are going to have the Atlantic Fleet in San Francisco Harbor. Can there be any naval exhibit that will equal that? You are going to have the Army at the Presidio. Can there be any exposition of the Government's Army activities equal to the actual soldiers and the actual guns; the actual Army itself there?

Now, what has happened? I am not going to take the time to read the statements made by Mr. Scott on behalf of the exposition company or the statements made by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] on behalf of that company, but they would have you believe that this is a spontaneous uprising on the part of the people of America to have this additional sum appropriated. What nonsense. Are we children? Do we not know the men who have been here in Washington for months? Do we not know something of the banquet that was given? Do we not know of the pressure that has been put upon men to vote this thing through? If other men do not know, I know, because they knew I was opposed to it, and I have had many men interested urge me not to make this fight. It is not a personal fight. I am doing what I believe to be my duty because of the promises then made to this House.

Oh, but they say you ought to have all the Government exhibits gathered together. What is the fact about that? The exposition company itself determined that it would be better to have the exhibits according to objects rather than from localities. For instance, they were going to have educational matters put together, so that you would have the effect of comparison. The Government exhibit was arranged to be put around according as the activities of the Government dovetailed into other exhibits. All of a sudden they discovered these exhibits must be grouped in order for the United States to have a creditable exhibit. Then they get the assistance of the Army in order to find some other excuse. Oh, how plausible they have been. First, when the fight was on, nothing was wanted. Then when the fight was won they made the excuse that they had not been able to get foreign Governments to exhibit. Now that the foreign Governments have agreed to exhibit, it is a new excuse. Now they say you must do it because the Army needs a building. If the Army needs a building at the Presidio for Army purposes, let us examine into it as an Army estimate and see to it that the plan is adapted to that purpose, and then appropriate the money, but do not let us be fooled and be made cat's-paws to pull the chestnuts out of the fire.

The Secretary of War comes before the Committee on Expositions and favors this proposition. I never knew a Secretary of War yet who was not anxious to get buildings and appropriations for the Army. And if he can get a \$500,000 building, even if it is not suitable he is that much to the good. As to his knowledge whether the building could or could not be built for the two purposes, I read this statement:

Mr. Koxor. You say if a building like that could be constructed, the exhibits could be housed in it and then it could be ultimately used by you. The question is, can it?

Secretary GARRISON. I do not dare to commit myself on that, because I know nothing about it. That would have to be decided by the Quartermaster General. I would have to take the judgment of some one else.

Further along, the Secretary says:

I would suggest to you, gentlemen, that if you are interested in the question of whether this money could be expended on that reservation in such a way as to be useful, useful to the Army afterwards, that you permit me to send up right now, if you have the time, for the Quartermaster General, and, if necessary, the Chief of Engineers, so that you can find out from them by asking for yourselves. I would find out by asking them, because in such matters I take the advice of men who are experts.

Evidently the committee did not have time, because the experts were not called. Now, we are told that because he appeared before them we should be in favor of it. He did not volunteer; he was asked to come and give his testimony. I have a proper respect for these distinguished gentlemen, but with that respect I think this House knows more about the history of these expositions, about the broken promises, about the faith that has not been kept, about how Congress has been buncoed in the past than all the Cabinet officers put together. [Applause.] Therefore, with all proper and due respect for the distinguished gentlemen, I prefer to follow my own judgment and the record in the case than to follow their recommendation in this matter. Five hundred thousand dollars! Why, we had a fight two years ago, after we had beaten the bill that provided for a commission of seven men and which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LEXBOOR] declared was the most indefensible proposition ever brought on the floor. They tacked onto the sundry civil appropriation bill an appropriation of a million and a half dollars. We had roll call after roll call,

and, in my judgment, it would have been possible to have defeated the proposal to appropriate anything. But we did not do it, we gave them \$500,000, and it was my understanding then that that was the end of the thing. Now, there seems to be no end—always there is a new excuse, always a new reaching out, always a plausible explanation.

How can the Congress rely on statements, what shall it take, what assurance has it now that we will not have to pay the debts of the exposition company on the ground that conditions were not what they expected, and therefore they are in a different position? Certainly not the statements made by the gentlemen on the floor to-day, because statements made by the same gentlemen on the same floor other days have not estopped them or the exposition company from coming here and asking for the money. I repeat that if Congress is going to have any respect for itself, if it is going to have any respect for the promises made to it, it must stand up now.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Is the gentleman from Kentucky in favor of the Government exhibit at San Francisco?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is beside the question, because the exhibition has been prepared and provided for. I was in favor of it, but I thought then and think now that San Francisco owes it to her own self-respect, to put it mildly, to pay all the expense of that exhibit.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Does the gentleman take the position that the citizens of San Francisco should pay for the National Government exhibit?

Mr. SHERLEY. I take the position that if I obtain something of value on my promises, if I am an honorable man I will keep my promises. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Is not the exposition in commemoration of the completion of the Panama Canal?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; but we have had expositions and commemorations of everything under the sun. What is the trouble about foreign Governments exhibiting? Is it because Uncle Sam is hesitating about furnishing money because of the promises that have been made? No; it is because the world is sick and tired of being buncoed in the matter of these expositions.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Foreign governments have agreed to exhibit, and it may be that they find it profitable.

Mr. SHERLEY. They perhaps have the same sort of pressure brought to bear on them over there that we have here. I know something about legislative bodies, and they are pretty much the same the world over. The proposition here is, Are you going to let them bunco you the second time? They broke their promise when they secured the exposition at San Francisco; they broke it when they came back and got \$500,000. Read the act that Congress passed. It provided that the exposition company should furnish the building or buildings to house the exhibit. If they wanted all the Government exhibit in one building, they had the opportunity right there. It was their right to have it determined and they determined it. The exhibits have been made up on that theory. Now, all of a sudden somebody discovers that that will not do, that we must have it all in one building at the expense of half a million dollars. The gentleman from Kansas says that he has been moved by sentiment for the great city of San Francisco. We all have admiration of that city's history in connection with its great disaster. But I do not like this sentiment at this time; it is too expensive, about half a million per sentiment. I am in favor of getting to the time where we may have faith kept. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired, all time has expired, and the question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 112, nays 109, answered "present" 6, not voting 206, as follows:

YEAS—112.

Allen	Broussard	Curry	Falconer
Ansberry	Byran	DeLrick	Ferris
Avis	Butler	Dent	FitzHenry
Baker	Campbell	Dershem	Floyd, Ark.
Bartholdt	Church	Dillon	Fordney
Barton	Clark, Fla.	Drukker	Francis
Beakes	Cline	Dupré	French
Bell, Cal.	Conry	Edmonds	Gilmore
Britten	Cramton	Esch	Godwin, N. C.

Good	Kettner	Nolan, J. I.	Steenerson
Goodwin, Ark.	Kindel	Norton	Stephens, Cal.
Graham, Ill.	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Oldfield	Stevens, Minn.
Greene, Mass.	Kirkpatrick	Patton, Pa.	Stone
Greene, Vt.	Konop	Peters, Me.	Stout
Haugen	Korbly	Plumley	Taggart
Hawley	Kreider	Rainey	Talbot, Md.
Hedin	La Follette	Raker	Talcott, N. Y.
Helgesen	Lee, Pa.	Reilly, Wis.	Taylor, Ark.
Howell	Lewis, Md.	Roberts, Nev.	Ten Eyck
Humphrey, Wash.	Lindbergh	Rogers	Towner
Johnson, Utah	McAndrews	Scott	Treadway
Johnson, Wash.	MacDonald	Sharp	Underhill
Kahn	Mapes	Sinnott	Vare
Keating	Mondell	Sloan	Volstead
Kelley, Mich.	Moore	Smith, Idaho	Watkins
Kelly, Pa.	Morgan, Okla.	Smith, Minn.	Wingo
Kennedy, Iowa	Mulkey	Smith, N. Y.	Woodruff
Kent	Murdock	Smith, Saml. W.	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—109.

Abercrombie	Dickinson	Hill	Russell
Adamson	Difenderfer	Holland	Seldomridge
Aiken	Dixon	Hull	Shackleford
Alexander	Donovan	Johnson, Ky.	Sherley
Anderson	Doolittle	Lee, Ga.	Sherwood
Ashbrook	Doremus	Lenroot	Sims
Bailey	Doughton	Lieb	Sisson
Baltz	Driscoll	Lloyd	Small
Barkley	Falson	Loneragan	Sparkman
Barnhart	Fergusson	Maguire, Nebr.	Stedman
Bathrick	Fitzgerald	Mann	Stevens, Miss.
Blackmon	Flood, Va.	Montague	Stevens, N. H.
Booher	Foster	Moon	Tavener
Borchers	Fowler	Morrison	Taylor, Colo.
Brumbaugh	Garrett, Tenn.	Moss, Ind.	Thacher
Buchanan, Tex.	Garrett, Tex.	Neely, W. Va.	Townsend
Burgess	Gillett	Oglesby	Tribble
Burnett	Goeke	Page, N. C.	Tuttle
Byrnes, S. C.	Gray	Palmer	Underwood
Byrns, Tenn.	Green, Iowa	Park	Watson
Carr	Gregg	Payne	Webb
Claypool	Hamlin	Peterson	Whaley
Collier	Hardy	Quin	Williams
Connelly, Kans.	Harris	Ragsdale	Wilson, Fla.
Cox	Harrison	Reed	Witherspoon
Cullop	Helm	Rouse	
Danforth	Helvering	Rube	
Decker	Hensley	Rucker	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Gard	Hay	Madden	Slemp
Garner	McCoy		

NOT VOTING—206.

Adair	Edwards	Kennedy, R. I.	Platt
Ainey	Elder	Key, Ohio	Porter
Anthony	Estopinal	Kless, Pa.	Post
Aswell	Evans	Kinkaid, N. J.	Pou
Austin	Fairchild	Kitchin	Powers
Barchfeld	Farr	Knowland, J. R.	Prouty
Bartlett	Fess	Lafferty	Rauch
Beall, Tex.	Fields	Langham	Rayburn
Bell, Ga.	Finley	Langley	Reilly, Conn.
Borland	Frear	Lazaro	Riordan
Bowdle	Gallagher	L'Engle	Roberts, Mass.
Brockson	Gallivan	Leshner	Rothermel
Brodbeck	Gardner	Lever	Rupley
Brown, N. Y.	George	Levy	Sabath
Brown, W. Va.	Gerry	Lewis, Pa.	Saunders
Browne, Wis.	Gill	Lindquist	Scully
Browning	Gittins	Linthicum	Sells
Buckner	Glass	Lobeck	Shreve
Buchanan, Ill.	Goldfogle	Loft	Slayden
Bulkley	Gordon	Logue	Smith, J. M. C.
Burke, Pa.	Gorman	McClellan	Smith, Md.
Burke, S. Dak.	Goulden	McGillcuddy	Smith, Tex.
Burke, Wis.	Graham, Pa.	McGuire, Okla.	Stafford
Caldier	Griest	McKellar	Stanley
Callaway	Griffin	McKenzie	Stephens, Nebr.
Candler, Miss.	Gudger	McLaughlin	Stephens, Tex.
Cantor	Guernsey	Mahan	Stringer
Cantrill	Hamill	Maher	Summers
Caraway	Hamilton, Mich.	Manahan	Sutherland
Carew	Hamilton, N. Y.	Martin	Switzer
Carlin	Hammond	Merritt	Taylor, Ala.
Carter	Hardwick	Metz	Taylor, N. Y.
Cary	Hart	Miller	Temple
Casey	Hayden	Mitchell	Thomas
Chandler, N. Y.	Hayes	Morgan, La.	Thompson, Okla.
Clancy	Henry	Morin	Thompson, Ill.
Coady	Hinds	Moss, W. Va.	Vaughan
Connolly, Iowa	Hinebaugh	Mott	Vollmer
Cooper	Hobson	Murray, Mass.	Walker
Copley	Houston	Murray, Okla.	Wallin
Covington	Howard	Neeley, Kans.	Walsh
Crisp	Hoxworth	Nelson	Walters
Crosser	Hughes, Ga.	O'Brien	Weaver
Dale	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Hair	Whitacre
Davenport	Hulings	O'Leary	White
Davis	Humphreys, Miss.	O'Shaunessy	Willis
Dies	Igoe	Padgett	Wilson, N. Y.
Donohoe	Jacoway	Palce, Mass.	Winslow
Dooling	Johnson, S. C.	Parker	Woods
Dunn	Jones	Patten, N. Y.	Young, Tex.
Eagan	Keister	Peters, Mass.	
Eagle	Kennedy, Conn.	Phelan	

So the motion to recede and concur was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. CARTER (for) with Mr. McCoy (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota.

Mr. GARNER with Mr. TEMPLE.

Mr. HAY with Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. COADY with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. HATES.

Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. PLATT.

Mr. CASEY with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. WOODS.

Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. FARR.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Speaker to order a recapitulation of the vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks a recapitulation of the vote. On as close a vote as this it ought to be had. The Clerk will recapitulate the vote.

The Clerk recapitulated the vote.

Mr. LOGUE. Mr. Speaker, am I entitled to be noted as present? I was not here during the call.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can count the gentleman as present to make a quorum.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I object to laying the motion on the table.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the gentleman's withdrawing the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves to reconsider and lay that motion on the table.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from New York demand a division of the question. The question is, first, on the motion of the gentleman from California to reconsider the vote by which the motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment 145 was agreed to.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FITZGERALD and Mr. SHERLEY) there were—ayes 66, noes 83.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 95, nays 110, answered "present" 6, not voting 222, as follows:

YEAS—95.

Abercrombie	Decker	Helm	Russell
Adamson	Dickinson	Helvering	Seldomridge
Aiken	Difenderfer	Hensley	Shackleford
Alexander	Dixon	Hull	Sherley
Ansberry	Donovan	Johnson, Ky.	Sherwood
Ashbrook	Doolittle	Key, Ohio	Sims
Bailey	Doughton	Lieb	Sisson
Baltz	Driscoll	Lloyd	Sparkman
Barkley	Falson	Loneragan	Stedman
Barnhart	Fergusson	Maguire, Nebr.	Stevens, Miss.
Blackmon	Fitzgerald	Moon	Stevens, N. H.
Booher	Flood, Va.	Morrison	Tavener
Borchers	Foster	Moss, Ind.	Taylor, Colo.
Brumbaugh	Fowler	Oglesby	Thacher
Buchanan, Tex.	Garrett, Tenn.	Palmer	Townsend
Burnett	Gillett	Park	Tribble
Byrnes, S. C.	Goeke	Peters, Mass.	Tuttle
Byrns, Tenn.	Graham, Ill.	Peterson	Walsh
Claypool	Gray	Quin	Watson
Collier	Green, Iowa	Ragsdale	Webb
Connelly, Kans.	Gregg	Reed	Whaley
Conry	Hamlin	Reilly, Wis.	Williams
Cox	Hardy	Rube	Witherspoon
Cullop	Harris	Rucker	

NAYS—110.

Allen	Dershem	Hedin	Lindbergh
Anderson	Dillon	Helgesen	Logue
Avis	Drukker	Howell	MacDonald
Baker	Edmonds	Humphrey, Wash.	Mapes
Barchfeld	Esch	Johnson, Utah	Mondell
Bartholdt	Falconer	Kahn	Moore
Barton	Ferris	Keating	Morgan, Okla.
Beakes	FitzHenry	Kelley, Mich.	Mulkey
Bell, Cal.	Floyd, Ark.	Kelly, Pa.	Murdock
Britten	Fordney	Kennedy, Iowa	Nolan, J. I.
Broussard	Francis	Kent	Oldfield
Bryan	French	Kettner	Peters, Me.
Burke, Wis.	Gard	Kindel	Phelan
Butler	Gilmore	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Platt
Campbell	Gittins	Kirkpatrick	Plumley
Caraway	Godwin, N. C.	Korbly	Rainey
Church	Good	Kreider	Raker
Clark, Fla.	Goodwin, Ark.	La Follette	Roberts, Nev.
Cramton	Greene, Mass.	Lee, Pa.	Rogers
Davis	Greene, Vt.	Lenroot	Rothermel
Dent	Hawley	Lewis, Md.	Scott

Sharp	Smith, Saml. W.	Talcott, N. Y.	Volstead
Sinnot	Steenerson	Taylor, Ark.	Watkins
Sloan	Stephens, Cal.	Ten Eyck	Wingo
Small	Stevens, Minn.	Towner	Woodruff
Smith, Idaho	Stone	Treadway	Young, N. Dak.
Smith, Minn.	Taggart	Underhill	
Smith, N. Y.	Talbot, Md.	Vare	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Garner	Madden	Slomp	Underwood
McCoy	Nelson		

NOT VOTING—222.

Adair	Eagle	Jones	Parker
Ainey	Edwards	Kelster	Pattee, N. Y.
Anthony	Elder	Kennedy, Conn.	Patton, Pa.
Aswell	Estopinal	Kennedy, R. I.	Payne
Austin	Evaus	Kless, Pa.	Porter
Bartlett	Fairchild	Kinhead, N. J.	Post
Bathrick	Farr	Kitchin	Pou
Beall, Tex.	Fess	Knowland, J. R.	Powers
Bell, Ga.	Fields	Konop	Prouty
Borland	Finley	Lafferty	Rauch
Bowdle	Frear	Langham	Rayburn
Brockson	Gallagher	Langley	Reilly, Conn.
Brodbeck	Gallivan	Lazarro	Riordan
Brown, N. Y.	Gardner	Lee, Ga.	Roberts, Mass.
Brown, W. Va.	Garrett, Tex.	L'Engle	Rouse
Browne, Wis.	George	Leshner	Rupley
Browning	Gerry	Lever	Sabath
Bruckner	Gill	Levy	Saunders
Buchanan, Ill.	Glass	Lewis, Pa.	Scully
Bulkley	Goldfogle	Lindquist	Sells
Burgess	Gordon	Linthicum	Shreve
Burke, Pa.	Gorman	Lobeck	Slayden
Burke, S. Dak.	Goulden	Loft	Smith, J. M. C.
Calder	Graham, Pa.	McAndrews	Sm th, Md.
Callaway	Griest	McClellan	Smith, Tex.
Candler, Miss.	Giffin	McGillendy	Stafford
Cantor	Gudger	McGuire, Okla.	Stanley
Cantrill	Guernsey	McKellar	Stephens, Nebr.
Carew	Hamill	McKenzie	Stephens, Tex.
Carlin	Hamilton, Mich.	McLaughlin	Stout
Carr	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mahan	Stringer
Carter	Hammond	Maher	Summers
Cary	Hardwick	Manahan	Sutherland
Casoy	Harrison	Mann	Switzer
Chandler, N. Y.	Hart	Martin	Taylor, Ala.
Clancy	Haugen	Merritt	Taylor, N. Y.
Cline	Hay	Metz	Temple
Coady	Hayden	Miller	Thomas
Connolly, Iowa	Hayes	Mitchell	Thompson, Okla.
Cooper	Henry	Montague	Thomson, Ill.
Copley	Hill	Morgan, La.	Vaughan
Covington	Hinds	Morin	Volmer
Crisp	Hinebaugh	Moss, W. Va.	Walker
Crosser	Hobson	Mott	Wallin
Curry	Holland	Murray, Mass.	Walters
Dale	Houston	Murray, Okla.	Weaver
Danforth	Howard	Neely, Kans.	Whitacre
Davenport	Hoxworth	Neely, W. Va.	White
Detrick	Hughes, Ga.	Norton	Willis
Dies	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Brien	Wilson, Fla.
Donohoe	Hulings	O'Hair	Wilson, N. Y.
Dooling	Humphreys, Miss.	O'Leary	Winslow
Doremus	Izoe	O'Shaunessy	Woods
Dunn	Jacoway	Padgett	Young, Tex.
Dunré	Johnson, S. C.	Page, N. C.	
Eagan	Johnson, Wash.	Paige, Mass.	

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McCoy (for) with Mr. Carter (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Candler of Mississippi with Mr. Griest.

Mr. Lee of Georgia with Mr. Danforth.

Mr. Page of North Carolina with Mr. Payne.

Mr. Goulden with Mr. Johnson of Washington.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. McKenzie.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Norton.

Mr. Reilly of Connecticut with Mr. Patton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. McClellan with Mr. Morin.

For the session:

Mr. Underwood with Mr. Mann.

Mr. Underwood. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know if the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Mann, voted?

The SPEAKER. He did not.

Mr. Underwood. Mr. Speaker, I have a standing pair with the gentleman from Illinois and I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. Underwood was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. McCoy. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Carter. I voted "aye" and I desire to withdraw that vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. McCoy was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. Humphrey of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. Humphrey of Washington. I thought there was a rule about Members standing around the desk.

The SPEAKER. That is in reference to the Clerk's desk, not the Speaker's desk. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have not voted, but I presume I can be counted for a quorum.

Mr. KAHN. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. NELSON, of Wisconsin, can be counted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair noted him as present; that is, the Chair will announce his name to the Clerk in a minute or so. Are there any other Members present who did not answer at all on this roll call? If so, the Chair would like to know who they are so that they may be counted. The Clerk will note Mr. NELSON, of Wisconsin, as present, and the Chair is rather inclined to the opinion, not dead sure about it, because the language is rather obscure, notwithstanding what the Chair said here a few days ago, that when a Member is counted as present that he has a right to vote. It is not very clear and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Butler] gave in his adherence to it, but it is a hazy kind of a performance.

Mr. Butler. The Chair ruled against me the other day; the Chair would not let me vote the other day.

The SPEAKER. If you read one section of the rule alone, the gentleman had no right to vote; but if you take two entirely different sections of the rule and put them together it looks like the intention was, when you come to the justice of the matter of counting a Member present, that he has the right to vote.

Mr. Garner. In the very nature of things, if he can be counted present he ought to have the right to vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will make that ruling, and the Clerk will call the name of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson].

Mr. Fitzgerald. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not entitled to vote.

The SPEAKER. Why?

Mr. Fitzgerald. Because the rule provides that no one shall vote unless he was present in the House giving attention when his name is called or should have been called. The question of whether a quorum is present has not been developed, and it is only upon a call of the House where the doors are closed and the Sergeant at Arms is directed to bring in the absentees that a gentleman can vote before the roll is closed whether or not he was here at the time his name was called. Under the proposed other ruling it makes it possible for a Member to come in and vote at any time.

The SPEAKER. Well, inasmuch as it makes no difference, the Chair will let the question stand open. However, the Chair with his present information would allow him to vote.

Mr. Fitzgerald. The rule authorizes the Speaker to have noted as present gentlemen who have not voted, but it does not give him any authority to permit a Member to vote who did not vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from New York, for whose parliamentary opinion he has great respect, to two different sections of Rule XV, section 1 of which is as follows:

Upon every roll call the names of the Members shall be called alphabetically by surname, except when two or more have the same surname, in which case the name of the State shall be added; and if there be two such Members from the same State, the whole name shall be called, and after the roll has been once called, the Clerk shall call in their alphabetical order the names of those not voting; and thereafter the Speaker shall not entertain a request to record a vote or announce a pair unless the Member's name has been noted under clause 3 of this rule.

Now, that is proposition number one. Here is clause 3.

On the demand of any Member, or at the suggestion of the Speaker, the names of Members sufficient to make a quorum in the Hall of the House who do not vote shall be noted by the Clerk and recorded in the Journal, and reported to the Speaker with the names of the Members voting, and be counted and announced in determining the presence of a quorum to do business.

Now, taking those two sections together, it does not mean that the Speaker counts a gentleman present who did not vote.

Mr. Shackelford. But, Mr. Speaker, has the point of no quorum been raised?

The SPEAKER. There is a time when the Speaker has to raise it himself. Whenever the roll call develops the fact that there is no quorum the Speaker must take notice of it, if that is the proper term. What does the gentleman from New York say to those two sections?

Mr. Fitzgerald. Mr. Speaker, in all the history of the House since the adoption of the rules referred to I have never known of an instance, either in the precedents or in the practice of the House, where a Member under these circumstances has been permitted to have his vote recorded.

The SPEAKER. Well, how the Chair came to dig into this matter was, after the interlocutory performance which he had with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Butler] here a

few days ago, one of the old and experienced Members of the House, who devotes a great deal of attention to parliamentary law, came to the Speaker privately and called his attention to these two sections taken in conjunction:

On the demand of any Member, or at the suggestion of the Speaker, the names of Members sufficient to make a quorum in the Hall of the House who do not vote shall be noted by the Clerk and recorded in the Journal, and reported to the Speaker with the names of the Members voting, and be counted and announced in determining the presence of a quorum to do business.

Now, turn back to section 1, and it says:

And thereafter the Speaker shall not entertain a request to record a vote or announce a pair unless the Member's name has been noted under clause 3 of this rule.

The Chair stated that the matter was not very clear, that it was somewhat hazy; but it seems if you take those two sections together—and especially section 1 points out section 3—that a Member that is noted by the Speaker or the Clerk, or somebody for him, as being present has a right to vote.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the Speaker hear me for just a moment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear any gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. I would like to be heard just as to the suggestion as to the effect of a rule that a Member coming in after the close of a roll call and being noted as present by the Speaker may vote. Outside of the question of the rule—and the rule does not seem to be entirely clear, although the practice has been entirely uniform—but outside of the rule the effect of a decision of that kind would be that it would not be necessary for Members to come in during the roll call. They could saunter in at their leisure and get in at any time before the announcement of the vote.

The SPEAKER. It is only in a case where a quorum has not developed.

Mr. MONDELL. I am assuming the somewhat chronic condition that sometimes exists, and exists now, where we are right on the margin of a quorum all the time. There is scarcely ever a quorum in the House at the beginning of a roll call or in the House at any one time. The quorum comes in and goes out; but if under those circumstances Members were not required to be here when their names were called they could come in at any time before the vote was announced and could be recognized by the Speaker and vote. It seems to me it would lead to interminable delay.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. In a minute. Inasmuch as counting the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] would not make a quorum, anyway, the Chair feels like leaving the matter open until we can have a general consultation as to what the rule means, because it is extremely hazy and extremely important, too, as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] suggests.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. KAHN. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] demands a division. Those in favor of the House adjourning will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Seventy-six gentlemen have risen in the affirmative.

The Chair thinks, after consulting the Manual, that the motion to adjourn as made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] at the particular time at which it was made was out of order—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER (continuing). Until after the announcement of the result of that vote. And there is not a quorum present. The yeas were 95, the nays 110, present 5, and I noted—not a quorum.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. It does not take—

Mr. KAHN. I move a call of the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I had moved that the House adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] had moved to adjourn. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MAPES. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAPES. The roll call having revealed that there is not a quorum present, does it take a majority of those present to

second the motion to adjourn before the Speaker can entertain it?

The SPEAKER. Oh, no.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is only after the call of the House.

The SPEAKER. Only on the call of the House. Of course the motion to adjourn takes precedence. The only trouble about it was that when it was first made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] it was out of order. The question is now on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. SHERLEY and Mr. FITZGERALD) there were—yeas 87, nays 79.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 104, nays 100, answered "present" 5, not voting 224, as follows:

YEAS—104.

Abercrombie	Callip	Hardy	Rucker
Adamson	Decker	Harris	Russell
Aiken	Dent	Helm	Seldoubridge
Alexander	Dickinson	Helvering	Shackelford
Allen	Diffenderfer	Hensley	Sherley
Ansherry	Dixon	Hull	Sherwood
Ashbrook	Donovan	Johnson, Ky.	Sims
Bailey	Doolittle	Key, Ohio	Sisson
Baltz	Doremus	Korbly	Small
Barkley	Doughton	Lieb	Sparkman
Barnhart	Dunne	Lloyd	Stedman
Blackmon	Falcon	Longreau	Stephens, Miss.
Boehrer	Ferguson	Magnire, Nebr.	Stevens, N. H.
Borchers	Ferris	Moon	Tavener
Brumbaugh	Fitzgerald	Morrison	Taylor, Colo.
Buchanan, Tex.	Flood, Va.	Moss, Ind.	Thacher
Burgess	Foster	Mulkey	Townsend
Burnett	Fowler	Oglesby	Tribble
Byrnes, S. C.	Garner	Palmer	Tuttle
Byrnes, Tenn.	Garrett, Tenn.	Park	Underhill
Claypool	Gilmore	Peterson	Walsh
Cline	Goeke	Quin	Watkins
Collier	Graham, Ill.	Ragsdale	Watson
Connelly, Kans.	Gray	Reed	Whaley
Coary	Gregg	Reilly, Wis.	Williams
Cox	Hamlin	Ituby	Witherspoon

NAYS—100.

Anderson	Fordney	Kettner	Raker
Avis	Francis	Kindel	Roberts, Nev.
Baker	French	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Rogers
Barchfeld	Gard	Kirkpatrick	Rothermel
Barton	Gillett	Kreider	Rosse
Beakes	Gittins	La Follette	Scott
Bell, Cal.	Goodwin, N. C.	Lee, Pa.	Sharp
Blythen	Good	Lenroot	Sinnott
Brennard	Goodwin, Ark.	Lindbergh	Sloan
Bryan	Green, Iowa	Locue	Smith, Idaho
Bryce, Wis.	Greene, Mass.	McKellar	Smith, Minn.
Butler	Greene, Vt.	MacDonald	Steenerson
Campbell	Hawley	Mapes	Stephens, Cal.
Caraway	Hayden	Monnell	Stevens, Minn.
Church	Hefflin	Moore	Stone
Clark, Fla.	Helgesen	Morgan, Okla.	Taegart
Cramton	Howell	Murdock	Talcott, N. Y.
Davis	Humphrey, Wash.	Nelson	Taylor, Ark.
Diershem	Johnson, Utah.	Nolan, J. I.	Towner
Dillon	Kahn	O'Hair	Treadway
Drukker	Keating	Oldfield	Vare
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Peters, Me.	Volstead
Esch	Kelly, Pa.	Phelan	Wingo
Falconer	Kennedy, Iowa	Plumley	Woodruff
FitzGentry	Kent	Rainey	Young, N. Dak.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Burke, S. Dak.	Madden	McCoy	Underwood
Carter			

NOT VOTING—224.

Adair	Carlin	Evans	Hammond
Alney	Carr	Fairchild	Hardwick
Anthony	Cary	Farr	Harrison
Aswell	Casey	Fess	Hart
Austin	Chandler, N. Y.	Fields	Haugen
Bartlett	Clancy	Finley	Hay
Bartlett	Coady	Floyd, Ark.	Hayes
Bathrick	Connolly, Iowa	Frear	Henry
Beall, Tex.	Cooper	Gallagher	Hill
Bell, Ga.	Copley	Gallivan	Hinds
Borland	Covington	Gardner	Hinchaugh
Bowdler	Crisp	Garrett, Tex.	Hobson
Brockson	Crosser	George	Holland
Brodbeck	Curry	Gerry	Houston
Brown, N. Y.	Dale	Gill	Howard
Brown, W. Va.	Danforth	Glass	Hoxworth
Browne, Wis.	Davenport	Goldfogle	Hughes, Ga.
Browning	Deitrick	Gordon	Hughes, W. Va.
Bruckner	Dies	Gorman	Hulings
Buchanan, Ill.	Donohoe	Goulden	Humphreys, Miss.
Bulley	Dooling	Graham, Pa.	Igoe
Burke, Pa.	Driscoll	Griest	Jacaway
Calder	Dunn	Griffin	Johnson, S. C.
Callaway	Eagan	Gudger	Johnson, Wash.
Candler, Miss.	Eagle	Guernsey	Jones
Cantor	Edwards	Hamill	Kelster
Cantrill	Elder	Hamilton, Mich.	Kennedy, Conn.
Carew	Estopinal	Hamilton, N. Y.	Kennedy, R. I.

Kless, Pa.	Manahan	Platt	Stout
Kinkaid, N. J.	Mann	Porter	Stringer
Kitchin	Martin	Post	Summers
Knowland, J. R.	Merritt	Pou	Sutherland
Konop	Metz	Powers	Switzer
Lafferty	Miller	Prouty	Talbot, Md.
Langham	Mitchell	Rauch	Taylor, Ala.
Langley	Montague	Rayburn	Taylor, N. Y.
Lazaro	Morgan, La.	Reilly, Conn.	Temple
Lee, Ga.	Morin	Riordan	Ten Eyck
L'Engle	Moss, W. Va.	Roberts, Mass.	Thomas
Lesher	Mott	Rupley	Thompson, Okla.
Lever	Murray, Mass.	Sabath	Thomson, Ill.
Levy	Murray, Okla.	Saunders	Vaughan
Lewis, Md.	Neeley, Kans.	Scully	Vollmer
Lewis, Pa.	Neely, W. Va.	Sells	Walker
Lindquist	Norton	Shreve	Wallin
Linthicum	O'Brien	Slayden	Walters
Lobeck	O'Leary	Slomp	Weaver
Loft	O'Shaunessy	Smith, J. M. C.	Webb
McAndrews	Padgett	Smith, Md.	Whitacre
McClellan	Page, N. C.	Smith, N. Y.	White
McGillendy	Paige, Mass.	Smith, Saml. W.	Willis
McGuire, Okla.	Parker	Smith, Tex.	Wilson, Fla.
McKenzie	Patten, N. Y.	Stafford	Wilson, N. Y.
McLaughlin	Patton, Pa.	Stanley	Winslow
Mahan	Payne	Stephens, Nebr.	Woods
Maher	Peters, Mass.	Stephens, Tex.	Young, Tex.

So the motion to adjourn was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McCoy (for) with Mr. CARTER (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.

Mr. GUDGER with Mr. CURRY.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. MCCOY. Mr. Speaker, I voted "present." I desire to change my vote.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

Mr. MCCOY. I withdraw my vote of "present" and vote "yea."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KAHN. If the House now moves to adjourn, will this come up as unfinished business to-morrow morning, or would it come up Thursday morning, to-morrow being Calendar Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think that it would go over until Thursday. The previous question was ordered on this, was it?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MCCOY. Mr. Speaker, I find that Mr. CARTER, of Oklahoma, with whom I was paired, voted "present" on the supposition that I was not here, so that I will have to change my vote again and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. McCoy, and he answered "Present."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KAHN. This matter coming up on a conference report, would not the conference report have priority on Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I think the language of the Calendar Wednesday rule is that "immediately upon the approval of the Journal" the Speaker shall cause the roll of the committees to be called, and so forth. I am not sure; I may be mistaken in my memory of the exact wording of that language, but I think it is "immediately upon the approval of the Journal." If I am correct as to that language, of course this could not come up to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Here is what the rule on Calendar Wednesday says:

On Wednesday of each week no business shall be in order except as provided by paragraph 4 of this rule, unless the House, by a two-thirds vote on motion to dispense therewith, shall otherwise determine.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to reconsider no previous question was demanded or ordered, so that it does not come within the category, although a motion of very high privilege. Of course, if this motion to reconsider is to be disposed of to-morrow it brings the entire matter before the House, and there is another amendment still to be disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has ruled on two or three different occasions, and the action of the gentleman from New York has borne out the ruling of the Chair, that even a conference report could not be considered on Calendar Wednesday except by unanimous consent. The gentleman from New York has asked unanimous consent on several occasions on Calendar Wednesday to set aside that day. Now, this is a part of a conference report. The present Speaker ruled that no bill could be taken up for consideration on Calendar Wednesday without

a motion to dispense with that day. The Chair thinks, under all the circumstances and rulings on the subject of Calendar Wednesday, the previous question not having been ordered on the motion to reconsider, that it goes over until Thursday. The Chair is desirous, as are the Members of the House, of observing the integrity of Calendar Wednesday so far as it is consistent with common sense.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

ADJOURNMENT.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, July 22, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Stamford Harbor, Conn., with a view to securing increased depth and removal of obstructions to navigation (H. Doc. No. 1130); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusion in case of James Crabtree, heir at law of Eli Crabtree, deceased, and executor of Sarah Crabtree, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1131); to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GOEKE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17894) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 995), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) granting permission to the Army and Navy athletic associations to use the polo field in Potomac Park, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 996), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 754) for the relief of Jacob M. Cooper, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 998), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 5065) for the relief of Mirick Burgess, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 999), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1063) for the relief of Philip Cook, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1000), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLAYPOOL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 5168) for the relief of the Kling Theological Hall, and authorizing the conveyance of real estate to the Howard University and other grantees, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1001), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 17919) for the relief of W. A. M. Streeter, and the same was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 17999) to provide for the establishment of an additional life-saving station at Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 18000) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Pittsfield, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18001) providing for the extension of the post office at Galesburg, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 18002) to provide for the making of farm loans from the postal savings funds; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER: A resolution (H. Res. 574) requesting the President to transmit to the House a copy of Prof. Ford's report; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 18003) granting an increase of pension to Sidney Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 18004) granting a pension to Susan J. McDermitt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 18005) granting a pension to Louis Naegel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 18006) for the relief of Frank Woodruff Kellogg; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 18007) granting a pension to Walter C. Lettie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 18008) for the relief of the Missionary Baptist Church of Toone, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: A bill (H. R. 18009) granting an increase of pension to Cecilia McCullough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A resolution (H. Res. 575) referring to the Court of Claims certain claims under section 151 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of E. P. Wheeler, New York, against woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Civil Service Reform League, relative to H. R. 17042, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the National Association of Assistant Postmasters relative to House bill 17042, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Department Veterans, Army of the Philippines, relative to civil-service conditions in Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CARR: Petition of 23 citizens of Rouse, Pa., favoring the passage of Sheppard-Hobson bill; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of Lockeford (Cal.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Woman's Council, Stockton, Cal., favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petitions of 7 citizens and residents of the third California district protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition by mass meeting of citizens of Lodi, Cal., signed by C. E. Durston, chairman, and John H. Williams, secretary, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of 7 citizens and residents of the third California district, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition by the First Baptist Church of Woodland, Cal., in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions by 177 citizens of the State of California, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Napa, Cal., in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition by R. W. Munson, acting chaplain, St. Helena Sanitarium, Sanitarium, Cal., in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition by the Musician's Protective Union, of Sacramento, Cal., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition by Lockeford (Cal.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Wisconsin Retail Jewelers' Association, of Neenah, Wis., favoring passage of the Owen-Goeke bill, relative to fraud in gold-filled watchcases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERGUSON: Petitions of the L. N. T. Club, by Mrs. C. B. Cannell, presiding officer, and Mrs. George Resley, secretary; the Pinon Baptist Church, by Rev. Y. F. Barnett, pastor, and Mrs. Mattie Rogers, secretary; the Pinon Baptist Sunday School, by T. F. Fleming, presiding officer, and Miss Linnie Resley, secretary; and 53 citizens, all of Pinon, N. Mex., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GERRY: Petitions of James F. Donovan, Edward Flynn, Thomas Padley, F. Nichols, Andrew Link, James Rooney, Vincent Castronovo, Augustus Angelo, Jeremiah D. Dailey, J. H. Carroll, Herman Duher, Lawrence A. McGrane, R. Williams, George W. Stage, J. Hansom, William Dexter, Henry Sweet, Michael H. McElroy, Walter A. Neuhon, Thomas L. Dowling, Philip Montell, J. N. Whelden, W. J. Murphy, R. J. Walsh, John Burns, J. H. Domling, John McDonnell, of Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of legislation providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of Everett E. Gardiner, Ralph J. Regniere, M. Hathaway, of Cranston, R. I.; John J. Quirk, of Warwick, R. I., protesting against the passage of legislation providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the executive committee of the Retail Merchants' Bureau of the New Orleans Association of Commerce, protesting against the passage of the Stevens standard price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of D. E. Weld and other residents of the first congressional district of Vermont, urging a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of sundry citizens of Rockingham County, Va., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of Council of Hamilton, Ill., favoring increased bridge facilities across the Mississippi River between Keokuk, Iowa, and Hamilton, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union and V. D. Michener, of Salem, Iowa, and 7 citizens of Lee County, Iowa, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition by the members of the Germania Quartette Club, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of the Hobson resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of Fred N. Rounds, J. G. Goodison, M. C. Mason, W. E. Whitford, M. W. Rounds, Fred D. Ricket, Roy Badger, H. Thomlin, R. Dow, J. J. Walker, Charles Witherell, Allen M. Gaslon, Gus Stratton, B. J. Mason, F. L. Rounds, J. S. Orr, B. W. Thornton, Arthur W. Young, Rev. Joseph Lobb, all of DePyster, St. Lawrence County, N. Y., urging the passage of the Sheppard-Hobson resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Herman A. James, E. S. Horton, W. A. Poyes, Duncan Paul, C. A. McAfee, S. C. Blauvelt, Seymour Williams, T. E. Lattull, W. MacDowell, J. H. Hallock, W. J. Oakey, R. Johnston, R. Amons, W. L. Richardson, T. H. Peycock, H. I. Baldwin, George Ray Schrader, E. L. Pearce, E. F. Schrader, W. S. Ames, O. W. Parker, W. J. Richardson, James B. Cameron, C. W. Park, A. E. Fraleigh, George B. Greenough, William G. Distin, William L. Distin, E. C. Horton, William M. Tilbee, Hugh M. King, N. A. Jennings, Elza H. Greene, G. W. Abbott, and James Rainey, all of Saranac Lake, N. Y., urging the passage of the Sheppard-Hobson resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, letter from Rev. A. G. Sunderland, pastor Methodist Episcopal Church of Chazy, N. Y., urging the passage of the Sheppard-Hobson resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Rev. Willis R. Ryder, pastor of Methodist Episcopal Church of Ellenburg, N. Y., in behalf of the societies of said church, urging the passage of the Sheppard-Hobson resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petitions of Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Philadelphia; Central Tube Co., James H. Matthews Co., George H. Alexander & Co., Monongahela Tube Co., Chamber of Commerce, Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh Meter Co., Union Electric Co., B. B. & B. Trunk Co., Germania Savings Bank, George A. Kelly Co., the Pittsburgh Dry Goods Co., Pittsburgh Hardwood Door Co., Alexander Laughlin & Co., John Daub & Sons, Thomas C. Jenkins, F. J. Kress, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against sections 7 and 18 of the Clayton antitrust bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring electric protection of vaults and safes in Government offices and buildings; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., protesting against House bill 13457, relative to United States surveys; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of the National Civil Service Reform League, protesting against section 3 of House bill 17042; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the Newlands amendment to the river and harbor bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the passage of the Harrison bill, to regulate sale of poisons, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against extension of parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against House bill 17139 and Senate bill 5664, relative to use of mails by insurance companies to procure fire-insurance policies; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 11178; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Protest of the California State Rural Letter Carriers' Association against section 4 of the Moon bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'HAIR: Petition of Post No. 257, Greenup, Ill., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring abolition of office of pension examiners; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: Petitions of Post Office Clerks' Association of California; Branch No. 290 of the National Association of Letter Carriers of the Santa Barbara Post Office; Branch No. 726, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of Santa Barbara; and California State Rural Letter Carriers' Association, protesting against section 4 of the Moon bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: Papers to accompany a bill granting pension to Cecilia McCullough; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Colorado, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petitions of sundry citizens of Tampa, Fla., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of 26 citizens of Bradentown, Fla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of Harbor City Post, Grand Army of the Republic, and Harbor City Woman's Relief Corps, at San Pedro, Cal., protesting against any change in the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.